

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 397

24

RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE TO STIMULATE RESEARCH IN GUIDANCE.

BY- LLOYD-JONES, ESTHER WESTERVELT, ESTHER M.
COLUMBIA UNIV., NEW YORK, TEACHERS COLLEGE

REPORT NUMBER CRP-F-008

PUB DATE

63

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.45 HC-\$12.36 309P.

DESCRIPTORS- COUNSELORS, *GUIDANCE PROGRAMS, *CONFERENCES, *GUIDANCE PERSONNEL, RESOURCE MATERIALS, *GUIDANCE COUNSELING, COUNSELOR TRAINING, *COUNSELING GOALS, COUNSELING SERVICES, GUIDANCE SERVICES, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

THIS CONFERENCE WAS THE FIRST STEP IN A 5-YEAR PROJECT FOR UPGRADING THE TRAINING OF GUIDANCE WORKERS THROUGH RESEARCH IN THE FOUNDATIONS OF GUIDANCE IN THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. ONE GOAL OF THIS PROJECT WAS TO OPEN MORE AVENUES OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN BEHAVIORAL SCIENTISTS FROM THE VARIOUS DISCIPLINES AND COUNSELOR EDUCATORS AND GUIDANCE PRACTITIONERS. ANOTHER GOAL WAS TO STIMULATE THE FLOW, ALONG SUCH NEWLY OPENED AVENUES, OF THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WHICH ARE THE RAW MATERIALS OF A STRONGER BRIDGE BETWEEN SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE AND ITS APPLICATIONS IN GUIDANCE PRACTICE. SUBJECTS OF CONFERENCE PAPERS INCLUDED (1) FREEDOM, RESPONSIBILITY, AND THE HELPING RELATIONSHIP, (2) SOME IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH IN PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT FOR COUNSELOR EDUCATION, (3) SOME IMPLICATIONS OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY AND RESEARCH FOR COUNSELOR EDUCATION, AND (4) A TENTATIVE TAXONOMY APPLIED TO EDUCATION. (LP)

2797-1

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE
*
TO STIMULATE RESEARCH IN GUIDANCE

Cooperative Research Project No. F-008

Esther Lloyd-Jones, Chief Investigator and Coordinator
Esther M. Westervelt, Administrator

Department of Guidance and Student Personnel Administration
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York 27, New York

1963

The research reported herein was supported by:

The Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

The Research Utilization Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, through a research contract awarded by the National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

The Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation

ED 003397

C O N F E R E N C E S T A F F

Conference Coordinator

Esther Lloyd-Jones, Head

Department of Guidance and Student Personnel Administration
Teachers College, Columbia University

Conference Administrator

Esther M. Westervelt

Department of Guidance and Student Personnel Administration
Teachers College, Columbia University

Conference Secretary

Ulrike Klopfer

C O N F E R E N C E L E A D E R S

Conference Chairman

Nicholas Hobbs

Chairman of the Division of Human Development
George Peabody College for Teachers

Project Scholars

Rollo May
New York City

Jerome Kagan
Head, Department of Psychology
The Fels Research Institute

Solon Kimball
Professor of Anthropology and Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

W. H. Cowley
Professor of Higher Education
Stanford University

FOREWORD

The conference reported here is the first firm step in a five-year project for Upgrading the Training of Guidance Workers Through Research in the Foundations of Guidance. One goal of this project is to open more avenues of communication between behavioral scientists from the various disciplines and counselor educators and guidance practitioners. A corollary goal is to stimulate the flow, along such newly opened avenues, of the questions and answers which are the raw materials of a stronger bridge between scientific knowledge and its applications in guidance practice. The project planners recognize that the building of the bridge, as well as the furnishing of materials for it, must be the work of both scientists and representatives of guidance, for developing a cement to hold the structure together will require the skills of both groups. Finally, the bridge must become a permanent channel for two-way traffic -- new theory and research findings coming from the sciences and new questions for research or criticisms of theory emerging from practice.

Guidance, in the context of this report and of the long-range project, means guidance and counseling in the American educational system. The circumstance of the selection of guidance in secondary schools for support under the National Defense Education Act, which greatly stimulated new developments in programs of education for secondary guidance, resulted in what may seem an over-representation of this area of guidance at the conference. However, the long-range project is concerned with guidance at all levels of education, from elementary through higher education.

Without the help and encouragement of many people, even the present tentative plans for the long-range project could not have been formulated and most certainly the conference could not have taken place. I want to take this opportunity to thank a few among these many.

Dr. William Hollister, Chief, Research Utilization Branch, National Institute of Mental Health helped me evolve the plan whereby four scholars were employed to develop the two sets of papers which provided the substantive materials for the conference and his advice continues to be an invaluable asset in the evolution of plans for future steps in the project.

Dr. Robert Beezer, Research Coordinator, Cooperative Research Program, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, helped develop the plan whereby it was possible for each counselor educator to invite to the conference a research partner chosen from the social science faculty of his own institution, with whom he could hope to work in the future. Dr. Beezer's counsel was also helpful in making available at the conference the consultant scholars from various disciplines.

Dr. Lester Nelson, Associate Program Director, The Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation, who is deeply concerned with fuller utilization of the potentialities of guidance in education, both helped devise the means through which support could be obtained for the participation of counselor educators in the conference and for the administrative costs of the conference, and also provided many thoughtful suggestions for the conference program.

The brilliant leadership which Professor Nicholas Hobbs, as Conference Chairman, gave to the conference itself, in addition to his generous assistance

with pre-conference planning, must be acknowledged here. Without his patience, perception, and finesse the few difficulties and discontents that did arise would have been multiplied many times.

Finally, I want to acknowledge most gratefully the unfailing and thoughtful cooperation of the conference staff. Dr. Esther Westervelt, as Conference Administrator and as writer, editor, and compiler of this report has worked with me so closely that we seem sometimes to be able to communicate without words. She has steadily endeavored to implement my plans and proposals and those of others who have contributed to these, yet has never hesitated to raise a question, offer a suggestion, or make a criticism if she felt it necessary.

Ulrike Klopfer, the Project Secretary, has handled an infinitude of details with unfailing efficiency and typed and re-typed drafts and final versions without ever losing her sharp eye for typographical and editorial errors.

There are many others whose interest and help should be noted here but for the sake of brevity I shall rely on the reader to discover their contributions in the report itself.

Esther Lloyd-Jones

June 30, 1963

EDITOR'S NOTE

The report submitted herewith is somewhat longer than was envisioned at the outset by its coordinator, and its editor, and probably also by its sponsors and its recipients. There are two reasons for its unexpectedly large proportions.

The first is the richness of the diet on which it fed. The taped transcriptions of the group discussions at the conference were so full of colorful exchanges which placed substantive materials in new perspective or illustrated the process of interaction between counselor educators and behavioral scientists that the task of selection was extremely difficult. Since neither time nor funds was available for a content analysis of these tapes, the editor attempted to incorporate in the report enough material from the discussions to give the reader some perception of the trends in thinking represented.

The second reason for the length of the report is the decision to include full transcripts of the papers given by the Project Scholars, in order that the reader who did not attend the conference would have an adequate basis for understanding its proceedings. The Project Scholars' basic papers which were distributed to the conference participants in advance of the conference are not included in this report because they have since been published. (See page 16 for a description and bibliographical reference.) It is hoped that the table of contents will help the reader to choose those sections of the report which will most interest him.

There are certain semantic inconsistencies which should also be mentioned here. One has to do with the use of the terms "counselor educator" and "guidance educator". It has been suggested that the latter represents a contradiction in terms and therefore, although it was used on the conference program and by some conference participants, in the explanatory sections of the text it has been replaced by the former. The former is in fact more generally used by the educators themselves, although this may possibly stem from the traditional definition of guidance as primarily a counseling function and from the long association of professional preparation in guidance with preparation for other fields of counseling.

Another inconsistency is in the use of the terms "behavioral science" and "social science" and "behavioral scientist" and "social scientist". The conference staff, in developing plans and proposals for the conference, chose the former term, partly on the basis of the argument advanced by Dewey and Bentley in Knowing and the Known that it offers the most comprehensive and appropriate definition of the study of man and society. Conference discussions quickly revealed, however, that the research partners and others whom we had labelled "behavioral scientists" were more apt to refer to themselves as "social scientists". Therefore the terms have been used interchangeably in the text, with some slight tendency to prefer the former, while the latter has been used to identify members of this group in the excerpts from the discussions.

Perhaps it should be noted here that participants in the discussions have not been identified by name unless it was possible to make such an identification from the tape. Otherwise, they have been identified only

as "counselor educator" or "social scientist", or, rarely, "project scholar" or "consultant scholar".

In order that this report may adequately reflect the dual concerns of the conference -- content and process -- material relating to these two concerns is presented in different sections. To accomplish this, parts of group discussions were excerpted to illustrate one aspect or the other. This has contributed to a certain discontinuity in these parts of the report; I can only hope that the discontinuity will prove provocative rather than irritating. In the interest of clarity, a certain amount of editing of these excerpts was necessary. To those conference participants who may find themselves misquoted due to the editor's inadequacies, my apologies.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that this report reflects, insofar as the limits of my competency permitted, the ideas and plans for it of the Conference Coordinator, Esther Lloyd-Jones. Such merit as it has is certainly due to her leadership and to her constant willingness to help me with problems in its preparation. However, all failures in clarity of expression, errors in editing, and mistakes in compilation must be attributed solely to me. Neither Professor Lloyd-Jones nor the secretaries -- Ulrike Klopfer, Joyce Robin, Barbara Wesp, Jesusa Moreno -- who worked long hours typing and putting the report together -- should share the blame for its weaknesses.

Esther M. Westervelt

June 30, 1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I The Problem	1
II The Objectives and the Plan	9
III The Project Scholars' Papers and Conference Discussions of Their Implications for Counseling and Guidance	15
Freedom, Responsibility, and the Helping Relationship. Rollo May	17
Discussion	46
Some Implications of Research in Personality Development for Counselor Education. Jerome Kagan	51
Discussion	92
Kagan and May Discussion	95
Some Implications of Anthropological Theory and Research for Counselor Education. Solon T. Kimball	109
Discussion	133
A Tentative Holistic Taxonomy Applied to Education. W. H. Cowley	137
Discussion	156
Joint Discussion of Kimball and Cowley Papers	158
Summary Panel -- Thursday Morning	165
Discussion	184
IV The Process of Interaction between Behavioral Scientists and Counselor Educators	187
Excerpts from the Small Group Discussions Monday and Tuesday, January 7 and 8	189
Excerpts from the Group Discussions of the Counselor Educators, Wednesday morning, January 9	205
Excerpts from the Group Discussions of the Social Scientists, Wednesday morning, January 9	215

	Page
IV The Process of Interaction between Behavioral Scientists and Counselor Educators (continued)	
Panel Discussion -- Wednesday afternoon, January 9	231
Group Discussion Following Panel Discussion	247
V Research Development and Program Innovation	261
Possible Directions for Strengthening Theoretical Content of Program and Developing Research Suggested by the Counselor Educators and Their Research Partners at the Conference	263
Ideas or Plans for Research or Program Innovations Reported Following the Conference	273
VI Evaluation of the Conference	277
Summary of Evaluative Comments Received Immediately Following the Conference	279
Summary of Recorders' Post-Conference Evaluation Session	280
Summary of Responses to Post-Conference Evaluation Questionnaire	281
VII Conference Follow-Up Activities	289
VIII Conference Findings	293
Appendix	

I

THE PROBLEM

Counseling and Guidance in the Educational System

The conference was designed to give impetus to wide-scale cooperation between counselor educators and behavioral scientists in research development and innovations in training programs which appear to be essential steps in the development of broader and firmer theoretical foundations for guidance practice.

An analysis of current conceptions of the work of the guidance counselor demonstrates that an expansion and enrichment of the substantive content of guidance training, drawn from the entire range of behavioral sciences, is much needed. School guidance workers today are expected to identify and encourage gifted students; to play a central role in advancing the educational progress of young people in disadvantaged urban and rural areas; to recognize early signs of mental illness and refer students for help before it is too late; to cooperate with teachers and administrators in developing a school climate favorable to the learning and development of all students; to interpret to parents and community the needs, capacities, and opportunities of individual students and of the school; to help all students, whatever the measure of their gifts and the extent of their advantages or disadvantages, make educational and vocational choices which will open the way to a socially productive and psychologically satisfying adulthood.

But until recent years counseling and testing were regarded as the central functions of the school guidance worker; the result is that training programs have been and for the most part still are grounded largely in psychology. Until a few years ago in most institutions (and presently, in many institutions) school guidance counselors received almost exactly the same training as students preparing for rehabilitation counseling, vocational counseling in community agencies, family counseling, and similar positions in which counseling in a dyadic situation will be the most salient aspect of their responsibilities. State certification requirements for guidance counselors clearly reflect the traditional view that psychological theory and tests and measurements are the most important tools of guidance.

For many years it has been obvious that the recruitment, preparation, and costs of employment of enough guidance counselors to give every student the optimal amount of one-to-one counseling (if it is upon such counseling that guidance programs must rely) is far beyond the means of even a society as affluent as ours. The guidance worker who must depend chiefly on counseling to help students too usually finds himself with time only for the "problem" students; his contact with the majority of the students is limited to tests and record-keeping. We have long recognized that if the guidance program in the school is to discharge its responsibilities to every student the counselor must acquire skills in working with groups and environmental factors as well as counseling skill. We are learning also that in some circumstances with certain groups of students, especially those from socio-cultural backgrounds different from that represented by school faculty, counseling by the guidance worker (who is perceived by the students as the representative of a distrusted system) is much less effective in promoting academic progress and healthy development than are changes in the system.

Meanwhile the demand for guidance workers is mounting sharply. Between 1957-58 and 1959-60 the number of guidance-personnel workers operating in our schools increased from 12,034 full-time equivalents to 18,739 -- an increase of over 50 % in two years. As a result the number of institutions offering training

in counseling and guidance is also mounting rapidly. In 1959 the United States Office of Education received from 315 colleges and universities indications of interest in offering guidance institutes under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act; in 1960, from 325; and in 1961 from 692. Of these, 21 were selected to conduct full-time training institutes in 1962-63. In 1961, 77 conducted summer session institutes.

The pressure of demand and the proliferation of training programs both sharpen the necessity for the expansion and enrichment of the content of guidance training. If such content and the standards established for it are to be consonant with current and future demands upon the field, counselor educators cannot delay the initiation of a well-organized search for the essential materials and means.

An equally vital consideration is that, if guidance practice and guidance training are to be founded on a theory of guidance appropriate to the circumstances of guidance practice today, a much more thoughtful and comprehensive examination of relevant scientific theory than has yet been undertaken is required. *Ad hoc* extrapolations, pieced together to fit the circumstances, resources and individual inclinations of various faculty members and institutions, may provide provocative points of departure for debate or experiment. They do not provide a systematic concept of guidance which outlines the scope of the responsibilities of guidance as a profession for prospective trainees and school administrators, teachers, students, and the general public.

Each new profession is created by the pressure of a social need. In the early stages of most professions the rationale for practice is derived more from the seeming nature of the need than from a comprehension of the scientific principles upon which effective practice must be based. It appears probable that the rate of growth of guidance practice is more the measure of increasing need than of increasing competency. Although improvements in competency are clearly discernible, guidance practice, if it is to adequately discharge its present responsibilities, must broaden and deepen its theoretical foundations as rapidly as possible.

Counselor Educators' Perceptions of the Problem

Leading counselor educators have recognized for some time that guidance work can no longer be grounded in psychology alone. Biology, sociology, social psychology, anthropology, economics, and political science, all have their place in the theoretical foundations of guidance training and guidance practice, and added to these should be insights which can come only from philosophy and the humanities.

The difficult questions are: how much of what? and, how shall it be taught and by whom? Each of the behavioral sciences is growing rapidly in compass and complexity; each contains many sub-specialities and many different and sometimes conflicting schools of thought. Thoughtful counselor educators who strive to find and to integrate into their training programs relevant theory and research find it difficult to focus their search without the leadership of scholars from the various disciplines. Furthermore, very little theory and research is clearly directed to current problems in the guidance field.

Research within the field itself is too generally poor in quality and limited in scope. It has relied largely on fairly simple statistics, rudimentary designs and questions directed at data collection to support some relatively naive thesis (e.g., the introduction of a guidance program increased the number of successful college applicants in School A from x to y in 2 years). Sophisticated statistical analyses, elegant designs, and research geared to theoretical development are sadly lacking.

The stimulus provided in recent years by the Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes established under the National Defense Education Act, through which funds have become available for intensive, full-time programs for resident students, has heightened counselor educators' awareness of both the need and the difficulties. At a meeting of Institute Directors in April, 1962 a discussion group explored the interdisciplinary contributions to the understanding of individual and social behavior which should be incorporated in guidance training. There was full consensus in the group regarding the critical importance of identifying these contributions and incorporating them in training programs, but much less agreement about how this would be done and also about the extent to which it was even possible in view of the rapidity of change in knowledge, the professions, education, and society, and of the lack of a clear view within the profession of the role and function of the school counselor and the related differing institutional approaches to counselor preparation. The central theme of the discussion was that, in the long run, professional development would depend upon better use of broader areas of relevant theory and that both together and separately counselor educators must work towards this end through every means they can find.

Barriers to Cooperation between Behavioral Scientists and Counselor Educators

There are certain attitudinal and structural barriers to cooperation between behavioral scientists and counselor educators which would pose difficulties even if the counselor educators had a clearer conception of their goals for such cooperation.

One barrier, which is doubtless as old as civilization, is the attitudinal difference between scientist and practitioner. The scientist who is interested in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is not always ready or even able to pause in his endeavors to suggest to the practitioner how such knowledge may be applied.

Although this generalization is probably less true of many behavioral scientists than of scientists as a whole, since the study of people and society may imply a certain interest in their welfare, a related generalization is all too applicable. In our era division of labor and specialization of function have been brought to a high level of refinement, and science has become increasingly atomistic, dealing with ever smaller segments. Each group of specialists, in the professions and in the sciences, evolves specialized tools, methods, and, most troublesome of all, terminologies. Thus communication between scientists from different fields or between practitioners from different professions is seriously impeded and sometimes blocked altogether. How much more difficult, then, is communication between a group comprised of practitioners and scientists drawn from various specialities. It is easy to understand why the guidance field tends to cling to its foundations in psychology and to resist adding other disciplines; during the decades when guidance practice focussed

primarily on the individual case, training and experience gave the guidance counselor and the psychologist at least the rudiments of a common language.

One striking result of our extremes of specialization is that even theory and research that is, at least on the surface, highly relevant to the work of the guidance counselor (e.g., research in child development and individual differences, research in patterns of vocational development, research in group dynamics) may be discussed and/or reported in terms that may leave even the counselor educator with no more than a general impression of its import, and that do not permit him to evaluate for himself the finer and often more critical aspects of its validity for practice. He needs a scientist as interpreter -- and if the scientist is to qualify as interpreter he must understand something of the nature of the practice in question.

There are also structural barriers to cooperation between behavioral scientists and practitioners which may seem even more threatening because they are more visible. One of these is the tendency toward sharp divisions and rigidly differing definitions of responsibility among the Schools or Colleges and/or departments of universities. Counselor educators are most generally found in Schools or Colleges of Education, behavioral scientists in Graduate Faculties or Colleges of Arts and Sciences. They have relatively little informal contact within their institutions and all too often, also, they harbor attitudes of condescension, hostility, or defensiveness towards each other. The scientist on the Graduate Faculties, although he proclaims the central importance of education to society, may regard the faculty of the College of Education as a collection of well-intentioned, muddle-headed generalists, while the members of the latter faculty, including counselor educators, may regard their colleagues in the behavioral sciences as so dedicated to learning "more and more about less and less" that they have lost all capacity to take a larger, practical view of individuals and society and their problems.

Hostility and misunderstanding feed on segregation and there is much in the structure of today's universities to segregate the two groups. Both carry heavy teaching loads; in addition both must publish regularly; the scientist especially, but also the counselor educator, must consistently be engaged in research, share his findings, and serve as a consultant. If he is prominent in his field he is expected also to attract money for research in it to the institution. And of course he must be active in a number of professional organizations. All this has been described in vivid and authentic detail elsewhere; it is sufficient to point out here that little time is left for cooperative efforts to introduce innovations in counselor education and develop research.

Finally, there is a structural barrier inherent in the effect on administrative policy and practice of the increasing size and complexity of universities, and of the growth in external pressures for service to government, industry, and foundations. Although these last are the source of funds for research, they are also, in the broader sense determinants of what research shall be undertaken. Research proposals or costly program developments which seem not apt to elicit appreciable support from one of these sources are not apt to receive the blessing of the administrators who scan such proposals. While the refinements of practice vary from institution to institution, generally speaking, faculty members or department heads cannot go in search of outside funds in any useful amount without such administrative blessing.

Facilitating Circumstances

The preceding paragraphs might lead the reader to believe that the project of which the conference reported in the following pages was an initial step is an impossible undertaking. In fact, however, its practicability, as well as its essentiality, has been demonstrated many times.

The classic illustration, of course, is that drawn from the field of medicine--the great reforms in training and the wide expansion of its scientific foundations which took place early in this century following the Flexner report, with its revelations of the terrible impoverishment in medical training. It is important to note that the impetus which upgraded medical education and attracted scientists to medical research came from informed public distress with medical service and from leaders in the medical profession.

The first essentials for similar developments in the guidance field are, then, informed public concern and leadership within the field itself. Both are present. Public interest in improving guidance services is clearly evidenced by the appropriations for this purpose provided in the National Defense Education Act -- appropriations which Congress is now considering expanding to cover preparation for all guidance services, from elementary school through colleges and universities. It is reflected also in the establishment of special guidance programs to meet special needs, such as the Demonstration Guidance Project in the Higher Horizons program in New York City. Some of the pressures from leaders in the field have been mentioned above; others are reflected in the commitment of both the American Personnel and Guidance Association and the Counseling Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association to the development of new standards for counselor education.¹

Also, despite the continued existence of many barriers to communication and cooperation among specialists, recent years have witnessed a sharp and promising upsurge in interdisciplinary endeavors in the behavioral sciences. While they still do not equal in magnitude or concrete outcome the complex teamwork which sends an astronaut into space, advances in this direction are both definite and steadily increasing.

Of even more relevance is the fact that some of these interdisciplinary studies have been directed at guidance concerns. Two salient examples are:

David C. McClland, The Achieving Society, New York, D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1961. This study explores the relationship between economic growth and decline in a society and the achievement motivation (i.e., motivation for economic achievement) of individuals, and the converse of this relationship, that between the achievement motivation of individuals and social forces. The study employs not only the theoretical frameworks of psychology, sociology, and anthropology, but also those of history, economics, and political science.

Donald E. Super, The Psychology of Careers, New York, Harper and Bros., 1957. This well-known work sets forth the theoretical framework

1. See C. Gilbert Wrenn, The Counselor in a Changing World, Washington, D.C., American Personnel and Guidance, 1962, p. 178.

within which Dr. Super is continuing to pursue a longitudinal study of career development. He stresses the fact that vocational development is a life-long process, not a moment of choice, and that vocational development is the continuing process of interaction between the individual's capacities and his social environment.

During the last decade or so there has also been more movement toward the construction of general theories which aspire to encompass the all possible studies of man, society, and their interrelationships within a single theoretical structure. Two well-known examples of such attempts are:

Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils, Toward a General Theory of Action, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1950. This well-known book sets forth the outlines of Parsons' attempt to interrelate all the basic theories of the behavioral sciences into a theory of man. Other volumes include Economy and Society (Parsons and Smelser, 1956) and Family, Socialization and Interaction Process (Parsons and Bales, 1955)

Gardner Murphy, Human Potentialities, New York, Basic Books Inc., 1958. In this work Dr. Murphy summarizes many years of study of human development. He emphasizes the infinite capacity for change of human beings, (including biological changes) and the interdependence of such changes with a complex network of changes in the social environment.

Finally, and perhaps most important, education as a field for research now attracts behavioral scientists in increasing numbers. A few examples of such research are:

Theodore M. Newcomb and E. K. Wilson (ed.), The Study of College Peer Groups: Problems and Prospects for Research, Social Science Research Council, 1962.

R. K. Merton, G. Reader, and Patricia Kendall (Eds.), The Student Physician: Introductory Studies in the Sociology of Medical Education, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1957.

James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press, 1961.

Nevitt Sanford, Ed., The American College, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962

Solon Kimball and James McClelland, Education and the New America, Random House, 1962. This study joins the perceptions of an anthropologist and of a philosopher in an examination of the present structure of our society, the place of the individual in it, and the implications for education.

It would appear that, although there are powerful barriers which will be overcome only through careful and sensitive planning, time and circumstances encourage the initiation of cooperative efforts of behavioral scientists and counselor educators to put guidance practice on firmer and broader theoretical foundations.

II

THE OBJECTIVES AND THE PLAN

Conference Objectives

In view of the nature of the problem the conference objectives were of two kinds and at two levels. The first objective was to facilitate the creation of a climate in which behavioral scientists and counselor educators would be encouraged to work together on new developments in programs of counselor education and guidance research.

The obstacles to communication and to the development of joint projects have been discussed in the preceding section. Cooperation between individuals or groups begins with communication and communication begins with the identification of areas of mutual interest and the possibility of mutual respect. The conference was designed, its planners hoped, to provide as ample an opportunity as time would permit for the behavioral scientists and the counselor educators to identify areas of mutual interest. It was further hoped that the recognition of common interests and problems would help engender or enhance mutual respect.

The second objective was
At the substantive level; the conference participants were asked to consider certain material from the behavioral sciences, included in the conference program, in the light of the following questions:

What knowledge (both theory and research findings) is now and potentially available from the behavioral sciences that should be applied in guidance practice?

How can the various disciplines of the behavioral sciences be used in training guidance workers both for practice and for carrying on research in the field?

What are some ideas for research that might be undertaken by the guidance educators and their research partners?

Also at the substantive level was the objective of exposing the conference participants to as wide a range of kinds of materials from the behavioral sciences as would be possible in a single short conference. Therefore the conference papers ranged from one which focussed on the one-to-one counseling relationship regarded from the point of view of existential psychology, through a report of some findings of a longitudinal socio-psychological study of child development, and a discussion of an anthropological approach to the study of educational systems which also contrasted the anthropological and sociological approaches, to an explication of a logical framework for a holistic approach to the study of higher education.

The conference planners recognized that such breadth of scope had drawbacks as well as assets. Among its assets, in their opinion, was the fact that the psychologically-oriented papers lay in relatively familiar territory but brought to bear perspectives not highly familiar to the participants. From focus on the individual, the papers moved to a focus on social systems, giving participants at least a general view of some of the differing perspectives, theoretical assumptions, and methods employed. It was hoped that such varied fare would help the participants, especially the counselor educators, to recognize the vast amount and variety of materials available, and also that the possibility would be enhanced for some of them to find at the conference an area of study which they particularly desired to further explore.

Among the drawbacks of this plan was the fact that any attempt at breadth of scope was inevitably severely limited; it could at best do no more than dimly suggest the scope represented by all the behavioral sciences, including their many specialized sub-divisions. Furthermore, the participants might well be irritated by the lack of opportunity to pursue detailed questions regarding different schools of thought within a given discipline, methodology, selection of material for training programs, and practical applications. Finally, this approach made it, in effect, impossible for any definite proposals for future action on conference concerns (either in program innovation or research development) to be fully developed at the conference. This last did not seem to the conference planners to be entirely a drawback, since operable plans are usually slow in developing and are best made at the institution within whose confines they must be implemented. Also, the consultant services of the Project Scholars were to be available to the participants at their home institutions if the latter desired them following the conference.

To move towards its two kinds of objectives the conference had to forgo the formulation of a more usual kind of objective for gatherings of this kind. That is, it did not address itself to a clearly defined problem in the academic sense of the term. There may have been a "problem" that would have stimulated the interest of both behavioral scientists and counselor educators and at the same time have opened up to them the complex problems and mutually beneficial possibilities involved in strengthening the theoretical foundations of guidance practice, but, although many presented themselves, the conference planners were unable to find one that seemed likely to serve this end in so short a conference.

The Plan of the Conference

The composition of the group invited to the conference was as follows:

The four Project Scholars, who had earlier prepared basic papers which were distributed to the participants in advance of the conference. These papers were developed in consultation with counselor educators, guidance practitioners and behavioral scientists from fields allied to those of the four Scholars, and were presented to an audience of counselor educators and guidance practitioners at the American Personnel and Guidance Association's convention in Chicago in April, 1962. They have since been published. At the conference the scholars expanded upon these papers and discussed them with the participants. The participation of the four Scholars in this project was made possible by a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health.

Twenty-one counselor educators, selected on the basis of demonstrated leadership in the field, the existence in their departments of a doctoral program which could serve research interests, the existence on their campuses of a graduate social science faculty from which a qualified research partner could be drawn, and the willingness to undertake, in cooperation with a research partner from the social science faculty, program innovation or research related to conference concerns. The costs of participation of this group were met by a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation.

Twenty-one "Research Partners" who were selected by the counselor educators from the graduate social faculties of their home institutions. Suggested criteria for their selection were an interest in research related to guidance concerns and demonstrated capacity to undertake or supervise such research; willingness to work with the counselor educators on program or research following the conference; scholarship in a discipline allied to those represented by one of the four Project Scholars. Participation of this group was supported by a grant from the Cooperative Research Division of the United States Office of Education.

Eleven behavioral scientists (to serve as consultant scholars) and observers from the sponsoring organizations and agencies. (Of eleven invited, three were unable to come.) The consultant scholars were chosen for their demonstrated interest in guidance and/or education, and for recognized leadership in a discipline related to that of one of the Project Scholars. The participation of the consultant scholars was supported by a grant from the Cooperative Research Division of the United States Office of Education.

Ten recorders, to both expedite and record the small group discussions. All recorders were either counselor educators or highly able guidance practitioners. Support for their participation was provided by a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education of Ford Foundation. All administrative costs of the conference and its follow-up activities were also provided by this grant.

Nicholas Hobbs, Chairman of the Division of Human Development, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, served as conference chairman.

Plans for the conference program were of course developed prior to the conference, by the conference staff, the Conference Chairman, the Project Scholars, and Frank Palmer of Social Science Research Council. However, it was recognized in the pre-conference planning sessions that such planning should not be adhered to too rigidly at the conference -- that insofar as possible conference plans should be modified to meet emerging needs and interests of the participants. Therefore plans were made for on-going evaluation of conference developments and directions through feedback from the recorders and through daily breakfast meetings of the conference staff with the conference chairman and four conference participants (Dugald Arbuckle, Lawrence Stewart, Robert Stripling, and David Tiedeman) who consented to serve as evaluators.

The conference program described below is therefore a modification of the original program. The primary aim of the original program was to provide a logical order of substantive content, opportunity for discussion and interaction in both large and small groups, and some free time for informal exchange. A copy of the program will be found in the Appendix.

The opening session on Sunday was an orientation meeting, devoted to a discussion of the conference goals by Esther Lloyd-Jones, Conference Coordinator, and Nicholas Hobbs, Conference Chairman.

As discussed in further detail in the following section, the Project Scholars presented their papers on Monday and Tuesday in the following order: Rollo May, Jerome Kagan, Solon Kimball, and W. H. Cowley. Following each presentation the participants broke into small groups, comprised of two pairs of counselor

educators and research partners, a consultant scholar, and a recorder, for the purpose of developing questions to submit to the scholars in a full group discussion which followed immediately. On the evening of each of these days there was a joint discussion of each set of two papers involving the two presenting Scholars and the full group.

On Wednesday morning there were two sessions of group meetings. During the first half of the morning the ten small groups were re-shuffled into six larger groups composed of counselor educators, research partners, consultant scholars, and recorders. During the second half of the morning, the counselor educators and social scientists met separately, two groups of each. The purpose of both these sets of group discussions was to explore what was happening at the conference and what the implications were for long-range conference goals.

During the first half of Wednesday afternoon each pair of counselor educators and research partners was asked to spend time together on developing an idea for further work on conference concerns. These ideas were written and turned over to the conference staff.

During the second half of the afternoon a panel of three counselor educators and three social scientists, who had been asked at the beginning of the day to undertake this assignment, discussed their perceptions of the content of the morning's group discussions regarding what was happening at the conference and the implications for future progress, and also advanced their own views. A full group discussion followed.

Wednesday evening was left free, but a number of participants took this opportunity for further questioning of W. H. Cowley, Solon Kimball, Jerome Kagan, and Adrian van Kaam.

The Thursday breakfast session of the conference evaluators revealed that the greatest need of the conference participants seemed to be for further clarification of the differences and conflicts in the existentialist and positivist-empirical approaches to the study of man and society. Therefore, Adrian van Kaam, who took Rollo May's place after he had to leave on Tuesday, Solon Kimball, and Nicholas Hobbs were asked to serve as a panel to discuss this subject. A full group discussion followed. This closed the conference, as a bus strike caused cancellation of the plans for a conference evaluation session during the luncheon period.

Each of the four papers given at the conference by the Project Scholars -- John May, Jerome Kagan, John Kibler, and W. H. Gentry -- was an expansion of a basic paper. These basic papers, with a commentary on each by John May, David Liberman, C. Howard Rooley, and E. G. Wittenberg, respectively, were distributed to the participants before the conference, that they might be familiar with the ideas which would be further explored and discussed at the conference. These papers and commentaries have since been published.

John May's paper, "Freedom and Responsibility Re-examined," discussed the interrelationship of control and autonomy, the relationship of these to the development of an individual's capacity for responsibility and freedom, and the implications for counseling. Jerome Kagan's paper, "The Onset of Behavior: Conflict and Continuity in Human Behavior," discussed the process of socialization and model-building and its relation to continuity and discontinuity in behavior. John Kibler's paper, "An Anthropological View of Socialization and Learning," discussed the educational process in anthropological perspective and learning. W. H. Gentry's paper, "The Development of the Capacity for Responsibility: A Tentative Model," discussed the development of the capacity for responsibility as a function of the development of the capacity for responsibility.

THE PROJECT SCHOLARS' PAPERS

AND

CONFERENCE DISCUSSIONS OF

THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR

COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

The program of the conference was designed to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and for the development of a common understanding of the issues involved in the study of the development of the capacity for responsibility. The program was designed to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and for the development of a common understanding of the issues involved in the study of the development of the capacity for responsibility. The program was designed to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and for the development of a common understanding of the issues involved in the study of the development of the capacity for responsibility.

The closing session of the conference, on Thursday morning, was devoted to a panel discussion by Nicholas Hobbs, Arthur von Kester, and John Kibler, which was concerned with some aspects of the concepts, conflicts, and tensions between individualistic and collectivistic approaches to an understanding of human nature and society. Prior to this panel were made at the conference when it became clear that many participants desired to further explore these issues. The transcript of this panel's comments and the group discussion which followed it form the final part of this section.

Editor: Lloyd Jones and Esther W. Kibler, eds., Behavioral Science and Human Development and Personality, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1963.

Each of the four papers given at the conference by the Project Scholars -- Rollo May, Jerome Kagan, Solon Kimball, and W. H. Cowley -- was an expansion of a basic paper. These basic papers, with a commentary on each by Adrian van Kaam, David Tiedeman, C. Harold McCully, and E. G. Williamson, respectively, were distributed to the participants before the conference, that they might be familiar with the ideas which would be further explored and discussed at the conference. These papers and commentaries have since been published. *

Rollo May's paper, "Freedom and Responsibility Re-examined," discussed the interrelationship of control and anxiety, the relationship of these to the development of an individual's capacity for responsibility and freedom, and the implications for counseling. Jerome Kagan's paper, "The Choice of Models: Conflict and Continuity in Human Behavior," discussed the process of model-choice and model-building and its relation to continuity and discontinuity in behavior. Solon Kimball's paper, "An Anthropological View of Social System and Learning," discussed the educational process in anthropological perspective and the potential uses of anthropology for educational research. W. H. Cowley's paper, "A Tentative Holistic Taxonomy Applied to Education," briefly outlined the taxonomy he has developed as a basis for a holistic approach to the study of higher education, and touched on the problems attendant upon evolving a taxonomy and the purposes it serves in study and research.

The presentations of the Project Scholars at the conference, which expanded upon the ideas contained in the basic papers, are reproduced in this section, in the order in which they were given. Each presentation was followed by a break for small group discussions of the material, after which the full group reconvened to discuss it with the presenter. In the evening of each of these days the full group met with the two scholars who had presented that day for a joint discussion of their two papers. Excerpts from the full group discussions of each paper and of each set of two papers are included here, in the order in which they occurred.

The closing session of the conference, on Thursday morning, was devoted to a panel discussion by Nicholas Hobbs, Adrian van Kaam, and Solon Kimball, which was concerned with some facets of the contrasts, conflicts, and tensions between existentialist and positivist-empirical approaches to an understanding of human nature and society. Plans for this panel were made at the conference when it became clear that many participants desired to further explore these issues. The transcription of this panel's comments and the group discussion which followed it form the final part of this section.

*Esther Lloyd-Jones and Esther M. Westervelt, Eds., Behavioral Science and Guidance: Proposals and Perspectives, New York, Teachers College. Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1963.

FREEDOM, RESPONSIBILITY, AND THE HELPING RELATIONSHIP

Rollo May

I plan to view with you some problems on which I have been pondering and working for some years. I will speak out of my own present experience, which is as a psychotherapist, and I hope and plan that what I have to say will have to do with the helping functions of all sorts. As far as I can see the problems that we will be discussing have to do with the fundamentals of the helping relationship. Though I may speak here as a therapist, I think all I have to say is also applicable to guidance; I will try to spell out at every point the specific relationships with guidance; I think they are there, and we can talk more about them later if need be.

Many of you will have, as I have, a nostalgic feeling about this conference, and part of my nostalgia goes back to the time when I was working at my doctoral dissertation at Teachers College and Columbia. I was then working on the problem of anxiety. And in the course of this work, I spent a year and a half in bed in a TB sanatorium. During that year and a half I read the two books that had been written on anxiety up to that period, namely, Freud's The Problem of Anxiety, and Kierkegaard's The Concept of Dread. I valued Freud's formulations--I knew already a fair amount about them; Kierkegaard was new to me. I knew Freud's first theory was that anxiety is emergence of repressed libido, the second that anxiety is an ego's reaction to the threat of loss of loved object. But Kierkegaard, on the other hand, described anxiety as the living being struggling against non-being.

This may sound like highfalutin philosophical terminology to you. The curious thing is when I was lying in bed facing death or the prospect of being a life-long invalid (this was before drugs did anything at all for TB) these terms of Kierkegaard said exactly what I was experiencing in my struggle, and also exactly what my fellow patients -- sophisticated or unsophisticated--were experiencing. Kierkegaard went on to point out that the terror in anxiety does

not come from death as such, but from the fact that each of us within himself is on both sides of the conflict. As Kierkegaard puts it, "Anxiety is the desire for what one dreads." And again: "It is as if an alien power lays hold of an individual (that is, anxiety) and yet one cannot tear oneself away."

What struck me with tremendous power up there in Saranack was that Kierkegaard was writing exactly what all of these patients and I were going through. Freud was not. He was writing on a different level, giving formulations of the psychic negativism by which anxiety comes about. Kierkegaard was portraying what is immediately experienced by human beings in crisis.

This was an extreme crisis. Life against death. But I think it is not qualitatively different from the crises that all of us experience a dozen times a day, a crisis that brings patients to psychotherapy and that by and large is the essence of the crises encountered in guidance. Kierkegaard calls it -- and what I would call it so, despite the fact that the words are so difficult -- the struggle of being against non-being. Being I define as the pattern of potentialities.

What we have in therapy are people who have struggled and betrayed and lost some aspect of potentiality -- generally a relatively severe loss. In guidance I think we have the same critical issue: Is this student (or whoever it may be) to betray, to give up some area of potentiality? I think this is a crisis that we all go through. Well, let me say almost all of us. I shall be going through it fifty times in the course of the next hour and a half and I hope you will a few times, too. And the crisis will be: shall we betray -- shall we give up some element of truth as we see it in order to be liked, in order not to have controversy?

This is the struggle of being against non-being. It is the struggle (if we want to put it into Horney's terms) of integrity of the self against betrayal of the self. If we want to put it in Freudian terms, it is the struggle of potent-

ality, in the sense of urge, against betrayal of that, which is in repression. I think the theory of repressed libido is also understandable in the denying of being. Now the curious thing about this experience of mine was that whereas Freud explained the technique by which it came about -- he knew more about this than any man of his time -- he nevertheless knew only about anxiety. Kierkegaard, a genius of a different order, was writing on what we call the ontological level -- and the difference was not in how much he knew about anxiety, but that he knew anxiety.

In those years I knew nothing, incidentally, about the whole existential movement in Europe, and, if I may say so, I think my Meaning of Anxiety is nevertheless, implicitly a very existential book. Most of us for some years in this country have been struggling toward a point of view that would deal not with notions about our problems but with our problems -- a point of view or an understanding of anxiety, of love, of sex, of aggression, of all aspects of life, that is not merely about the techniques by which they work, the mechanisms, but rather deals with them.

This problem is set by the particular cultural-historical situation we find ourselves in. We in the Western world are the heirs of four centuries of tremendous technical achievement in power over nature, and in the last 50 years in the same kind of power over ourselves. This is our greatness and at the same time is our greatest peril. We are not in danger of repressing the technological emphasis. Freud's popularity, for example, is related to Freudian mechanisms, not the Freudian symbols, which are much more important in my judgment. The dogmatic enthusiasm with which the Freudian mechanisms were accepted in this country is an illustration that we are in no danger whatever of overlooking the technological-technical side. But are we not rather in radical danger of repressing the opposite, namely, the ideas that are not postulates about the human being but aspects of the human being himself? Have we not already done this to a great extent? Have we not repressed the characteristics of the human being which are not tech-

nical nor reducible to technical problems? That is, have we not repressed concern with being itself?

If you are going to die you are not faced with a technical question. If I am going to betray some thought of mine and repress it because some of you may not like it, I am not faced with a technical question; I am faced rather with a question of which in my own terms I would say, this is an ultimate question. Nothing terribly much hangs on it. I can get away with conforming to you one hundred times during this next hour and a half and you won't know it. I will know it at some level. One can get away with this, one does all the time. However, it nevertheless has the quality of an ultimate question. It is part of the struggle of being against non-being, even though I will go on living and so will you. But I will have lost some possibility of originality, deepened experience; and I have surrendered some potentiality for growth in my own consciousness.

The human qualities that are not technical are qualities of responsibility, qualities of freedom, of choice. Heisenberg, the great physicist of the quantum theory, in a very good discussion of the machine in his essay on nature and philosophy, says that the trouble with machines is not the machine itself, but that it makes us uncertain in the impulses of the spirit. I think it makes us uncertain in the impulses that constitute a human being as human. And this is, of course, our problem when we get into questions of responsibility, freedom, and so on.

We all are aware of the dangers of scientism, that is of being enthralled with techniques, worshipping the form of science at the price of losing man. Scientism is a defense, in the same way that any dogma is. The trouble is, it is much harder to see this in our culture because scientism is so acceptable culturally, so successful -- temporarily. But nevertheless, it is a grave danger. Scientism is radically different from science as such, and I think we must remind ourselves continuously that science was made for man and not man for science.

From the time of those years up in Saranac I have been concerned with a lasting question, and that is: what approach to science can serve as a basis for psychotherapy, psychoanalysis and guidance? I want to suggest to you in the next few minutes, in the theoretical part of my paper, before I get to the more practical part, some principles that seem to me to be essential for a science that can be a basis for guidance and counseling. This is a science that deals, at least so far as it can, with the human being as human.

Now my first principle is this: Such a science must be relevant to the distinguishing characteristics of what we are trying to understand. In this case, of course, it's the human being. It must be relevant to the distinguishing characteristics which make this human being human, which constitute the self as self, without which this being would not be what he is, namely, a human being. I do not mean, obviously, to derogate what the human being has in common with Pavlov's dogs, with the white rats, with pigeons, and with any other of our animal friends. But I do mean to say that, if this is our chief focus, we inevitably will have to omit (and we do omit, without knowing it, which is more serious) the areas in human experience that are precisely the areas we deal with in therapy and guidance. What we deal with in therapy and guidance, as I will indicate all the way through here, are the qualities that make the human being human. These are what go awry in neurosis.

But Kenneth Spence, for example, who represents one aspect of behavior theory and conditioning, writes as follows: "The question of whether any particular realm of behavior phenomena is more real or closer to real life and hence should be given priority in investigation does not, or at least should not, arise for the psychologist as scientist." Rather, says Spence, priority should be given to those phenomena which lend themselves "to the degrees of control and analysis necessary for the formulation of abstract laws." I can understand this point of view, but I propose to disagree radically with it this morning. I propose to take a point of

view that, in some ways, is opposite. Namely, that if we do deal -- as psychologist, or scientist or any social science -- with the phenomena that lend themselves to degrees of control and analysis for formulations of abstract laws, we simply must leave out the essences of the problems we deal with in counseling and therapy.

Freedom, or self-determination, as Dr. Tiedeman puts it, responsibility, all aspects of decision, love, once you get beyond the biological level -- these problems do not lend themselves either to the control or to the formulation of abstract laws. For example there is a point -- I don't want to go deeply into it now -- which is exceedingly interesting and important. (I think William James said something like it, too.) The act of decision in the person is an essential determinant in the patterns that must be understood if you are to understand that person's reactions. That is to say, once you bring into the picture the problem of human decision, then you change the problem, at least in the ways all of us were taught. We change the problem of abstract formulation because there is another element that you are going to have to take into account. Heisenberg says regarding the physicist's formulations, the physicist has to take into account his own self, as subject, in his formula. Now this factor -- as Heisenberg and Bohr and others have understood -- radically changes the relationship with nature.

I think we have to be sufficiently imaginative to do this in psychology. I think it can be done; I am not at all giving the counsel of despair. I think it is going to take a kind of radical thinking, a kind of imagination that most of us have not really undertaken. Take, for example, the problem of sex. If you desire to study sex on the basis of phenomena that lend themselves to degrees of control and analysis for the formulation of abstract laws, you can take sex as a biological drive. It then is relatively easy to study. You can formulate your abstract laws without too much difficulty. Kinsey did this as a zoologist. In Kinsey's terms, man gets a sexual "object" (presumably a woman does, too, though I don't like to think of myself as a sexual object; however, this is the term he uses).

In behaviorism sex is generally conceptualized as a drive, and in Freud also, although Freud never could stick to this idea. I think his genius is that always his symbolism and mythology broke the boundaries of his biological concept of drive.

If you take sex as a drive you can study it and you can make your formulation without too much difficulty. The only trouble is, sex as a drive is what you never find in therapy and guidance except in the most severe cases of pathology. I can conceive of a soldier being in the Arctic for a year without seeing a woman, coming back to New York City and genuinely experiencing a drive. It was Louis XVI who said, "any woman will do, all you've got to do is take her to the dentist and give her a bath." Now that may be all right for Louis XVI. I think I can imagine human beings in that situation, but I can't really. For example, in the case of the soldier, it may be a drive, bang, and that's all, but I would know that he would have thoughts about it afterwards. Those thoughts make it something quite different from a drive.

Now what you get in sex, as Dr. Kagan has so well pointed out, is not at all the problem of libido as such; sure it is there and I don't deny it for a moment; I for one take the body and sexuality very seriously, which distinguishes me somewhat from some of my colleagues in the interpersonal school. But who the sexual partner is makes a tremendous amount of difference. One is attracted by some women more than others. Some women may represent mother images, others a defiance of the mother image, or aspects of tenderness, prestige, status, proof of manliness. There are influences upon middle-class boys that make their reactions to sex quite different from proletarian boys, although there is no difference whatever in libido.

These differences occur on a higher level of integration. They are distinguished by the fact that the human being is capable of consciousness and of the use of symbols. And therefore sexuality, when we deal with it in guidance and counseling, is a problem on this higher, uniquely human, level.

I think there is a tremendous mistake in the whole movement of sexual emancipation. I think that it has backfired. What resulted is a tremendous amount of loneliness and isolation on the part of the most emancipated people. For example, consider sex as you find it on college campuses. It is limited as hell and also somewhat pathetic. Everybody is afraid to let go of his partner. Now these are sexually emancipated kids. They are going to bed with each other at 18. But the problem of responsibility, and all the anxiety this entails, is repressed. If you would be emancipated, it means you lay somebody and let it ride. But the thing is that nobody can let go of anybody. They dance always with the same partners at college dances, which is the most unconstructive way of learning to know the opposite sex in any way except in bed. And then they get married early. And, as has been discussed in a number of books, the women imbued with a feminine mystique, have four or five children before they are 30 and find themselves, at 35, absolutely bored with life -- and desperate, too. I think that this is a problem which is partly due to the backfiring of an oversimplified view of sex as a biological drive. A lot of the problems you get in adolescence are going to be hooked up with sex.

Let me now state again the first principle: our science must be relevant to the distinguishing characteristics of the human being as human -- the distinguishing characteristics of what we are trying to study.

The second principle is: man is distinguished by the fact that he is the symbol-using organism. I could say symbol-using animal but I think that is a falsehood, because symbol-using is exactly what animals do not do. I speak of symbols here, and not signs. Symbol-using arises out of a uniquely human capacity. It arises out of the capacity to experience oneself as subject and object simultaneously -- the experience of having a world. Symbol-using begins very early in the child's life. As far as I can learn from my studies, it begins at the age of four to six months, then develops into the capacity for use of language and reason.

Because of his capacity to use symbols, the human being has a distinguishing capacity in relation to time. He has the capacity to have a future, and therefore has a distinctive relationship to history.

I'm aware of all the conflict and discussion in this field. I have talked at length with Liddell, Harlow, Goldstein -- these men who have studied the biological and neurological relationships in animal behavior much more than I have. But I give you here what I think the truth, at least as I can distill it. You see, no matter how long Harry Harlow associates with his monkeys out there in Wisconsin, (I spent a wonderful afternoon out there) they never start talking. No matter how much they associate with their chimps at Yale, they don't start talking, either with a Wisconsin or a Yale accent.

The relation to symbols -- not signs now, but symbols -- comes out of my capacity to experience myself as a self having a world and then to experience this in symbolic fashion. This is a distinguishing characteristic of a human being.

We must aim to understand this symbol-using if we want to understand what goes on in guidance and therapy. Dr. Kagan's ideal model, as I will say later in my paper, is a symbolic process. The locus of the problems with which we deal in therapy and guidance, is in the symbolic process, i.e., repression, the blocking of awareness, the denial of potentiality, the distortion of self image, and so on. You can read Lawrence Kubie on this, if you wish, who says, and I think very rightly, that the symbolic processes that concern the child emerge in a certain period of development -- at the point when the capacity for consciousness or unconsciousness becomes present, at which time also emerges the capacity for repression, resistance, lying to oneself. A most interesting phenomenon is this ability to lie to oneself: it means that I know I am lying but I repress that fact that I know that I am lying in order to make the lie work. Now all of these phenomena, which certainly appear in the people we get in guidance, result in distortion of oneself, of one's potentiality, one's self image, of the

image of others, and so on. It is the distortions that occur by virtue of this capacity that I here cite as a characteristic of a human being.

My third principle is one that is in opposition to an assumption that most of us were taught -- that the more complex phenomena must be understood by the more simple. This was given to me as an underlying principle in all of my scientific courses in college. This comes from our evolutionary assumption. I propose something opposite to that, namely, that the simpler can be understood only in terms of the more complex. I think the model of evolution, for example, that human love can be understood in terms of love among monkeys, is a half truth which leads us astray, and away from our most important data.

Let me interrupt here for a moment for another reminiscence, to show you how complex these problems are. Harry Harlow and I gave papers, his right before mine, at the Ortho-Psychiatric meeting some four or five years ago; and Harlow talked about love, and so on, among his monkeys. This was a most engaging lecture, and of course these monkeys in the slides are most delightful creatures. The trouble is that you love them, and one gets into great confusion as to what's going on. At any case Harlow talked most effectively there. I said, when I began my talk, that Harlow's paper meant very much to me, his work throws considerable light on various things about human beings, but I could not believe that the love that he was talking about can be carried over directly to human beings.

I think we tend to slide into understanding a more complex phenomenon by the simpler, and then we do not realize that we have taken the simpler and substituted it for the more complex. I have illustrated this already in the problem of sex. As a matter of fact, the biology of sex can only be understood in human beings in the context of the fact that human beings associate or see sex in terms of symbols, relationships, and models, etc. When a new level of complexity emerges, such as consciousness in man, this level becomes decisive for understanding all previous levels. Kurt Goldstein, for example, says that biology cannot genuinely be under-

stood except as you understand it from the point of view of the consciousness of man.

Now my fourth principle is: the human being can be understood partially by various methods but can be fully understood only as being-in-a-world. There is no self without world and no world without self. By world here I mean a meaningful structure of events. That is to say, there is no behavior without its subjective pole, no objective pole without its subjective aspect, and vice versa.

We cannot understand an item of behavior except as we have some understanding of the subjective meaning to the person who is undertaking this item. A student may smile excessively when he comes for guidance. This may be due to shyness, it may be because he wants you to like him, it may be due to the fact that he likes you, it may be that he gets some pleasure out of dealing with the significant problems that you are dealing with, it may be seductiveness -- the smile may thus have an infinite number of meanings. If we take a human as a being-in-a-world, then the objective behavioral act is inseparable always from its subjective meaning.

I am not caught in an idealism or introspectionism here because I say at the same time that the subjective can be understood only in terms of its objective behavioral pole. Here again Drs. Kagan and Tiedeman have made this clear in their papers. The behavior itself is always ambiguous. I think what I am saying now is also true for Dr. Cowley's concept of holism. I think Professor van Kaam's discussion of history and tradition and his comment on my paper was excellent on this point. I think we must take history much more seriously. I am glad there is a historian here.

As Dr. van Kaam and I and others have pointed out, the body, if nothing else, makes inevitable our participation in this world. So long as I'm a being-with-a-body, I'm a being-in-the-world. I think history is our body with respect to humanity. I think human history is much more dynamic than we generally assume.

When I try to understand what went on among the ancient Greeks, what went on in Augustine, in Spinoza, in Kierkegaard, there is something going on which is a distinguishing characteristic of me as a human being -- and is necessary to the extent that I am a being-in-a-world. I propose that we take history in this sense much more seriously.

My fifth and last principle is: the unit-of-study in the science of guidance and psychotherapy is not, say, a student who has a problem like failing, not a patient of mine who has a neurotic problem like sado-masochism, not a hospital diagnostic category of sickness like phobia or neurosthenia, but, rather, the unit-of-study is two persons existing in a world. This is a corollary of what I've just said about being-in-a-world. The world to be considered is the world of that moment in guidance or psychotherapy -- my office, your consulting room -- our world. We are beings in a world now existing -- a world which is constituted by the meaning which we are talking about.

Certainly how we feel bodily and geographically could be measured by the walls of this room. That is to say, the speech I am giving is partly made by you. We participate with and in each other. What I say here is determined partially, in ways of which I am only partly aware, by what you are thinking. This is not a mystical statement. Its meaning is very clear in guidance and therapy. What we have to study is, as Sullivan said, two people in an interpersonal relationship. The skillful therapist, sooner or later -- (and this takes skill, intuition, and lots of other things) -- learns to feel to resonate within himself on levels of the not wholly conscious, the way a violin would resonate when another violin is played in the same room. Therefore, he often is aware of feelings, states or conditions in patients that are quite a bit below the level of awareness. These may come out in the patient only weeks later.

Now every good therapist knows this -- that using one's own intuition if it doesn't merely reflect his own problems, is the only way of telling what is under-

neath what the patient is trying to say, even when it may be that the patient himself does not understand it. Alfred Adler says the technique of treatment must be in yourself. This is only a simplified way of saying: what you have is two people here together. What goes on between them seems to me to be the unit of study in our field. This is what we've got; this is our phenomenon and a tremendously rich phenomenon if one can use it.

Let us go on to the application of these principles. The first application comes directly out of our last principle. What does it mean in guidance and therapy that two people are together in a room with the hope of one of them gaining some help? What is the meaning as the Germans put it of mitsein, that is being together?

I want to approach this from the point of view of the helping motivation. I think our desire to help is our most desirable asset as counselor or therapist, but it also leads us into our greatest danger. I think it's the sine qua non of therapy or counseling; it is a curative function. Some of these students who come to you will experience for the first time in their lives that somebody is genuinely interested in them without needing to use or manipulate them in some way. I hope that in your guidance interviews even though you have responsibility to the school, college or society, there will always be an element in your relation to the other person through which he can experience that you are related to him because he is he, he as a person, in terms of his realization of himself, and not for a manipulative purpose.

This relationship in itself has a pronounced curative effect. We can, of course, do this much more easily if we don't have responsibility for this person to success -- in his studies. Being able to feel that what we genuinely want is the welfare of that human being has an effect upon the patient that is very great. Let me give you some research that backs this up.

This research was done out at Mount Sinai Hospital in Los Angeles by Franz Alexander and his associates. What they did was to have a patient and analyst, with a group of analysts watching over a period of years through a one-way window. In evaluation the patients were also asked their reactions as to what had been of help. The patients, of course, knew what was going on and they felt (how true this is is another question) that they could go on with the analysis all right, despite the fact that it was observed. I'll take their word for it for the moment.

Two quite dramatic cures included somatic ailments as well as cures on other levels. One patient was asked what affected him most. He replied that the most meaningful thing was that the therapist was dependable. The other therapists watching this analysis felt that the therapist was not dependable. He cancelled hours without warning, he shifted hours, he went off on vacations without telling patients ahead of time. The other patient was asked what he felt had most to do with his cure. He replied, "I was most affected by the fact that the therapist liked me." The observers behind the screen felt that the therapist didn't like this patient; he seemed highly contemptuous of the patient, and the therapist himself said he hadn't liked this patient much. The consensus of the observers was that what the patient thought he experienced was partially a distortion of transference, which was understandable, but that what the patient was really reacting to was the therapeutic intent of the therapist. The therapist genuinely wanted to help this person.

You may want to help for many different reasons. You may also be undependable and so on. These are complicated problems. They mean that our present understanding of human beings is not as simple as our earlier schemes used to be. Of course, the therapist himself may not be an "adjusted personality." Some of the best of our therapists have been quite screwy as personalities. That is not the point. The thing I'm trying to get at and what Alexander and his colleagues said is that the effective element was the therapeutic intent.

The motivation for wanting to help can also lead to our greatest danger, namely, the playing of God on the part of the therapist or guidance counselor. It seems to me that the inner life of the therapist or guidance counselor always is, to the extent he is not compulsive or rigid, a dialectical fluctuating polarity between the desire to help (the therapeutic intent) and the desire to control. For example, if one is fatigued, one prefers that the patient not bring up difficult things. Or let's say if my wife blew up at me at breakfast I would just as soon deal with a patient that did not blow up. Fortunately most of us either know enough or have enough experience to analyse out our own biases so we get absorbed in the patient and forget about our other private problems. We behave for very sound reasons which are not exploitative, yet we want sometimes to control a patient; for example, to get him to be quiet, because somebody is talking in the next room or we don't want our colleagues next door to hear this guy screaming at us -- all this kind of stuff. This all reflects our desire to control the other person.

Between these two poles -- the desire to help and the desire to control -- it seems to me, we oscillate all the time. The important thing is to be aware of it. If one isn't aware of it then the tendency always is for the desire to help, which I assume will be there in a greater or lesser degree with all of us, to get subordinated to our feeling that for this person's own good he ought not to shout. I would keep this dialectic always sensitive. I would keep it always open. My problem, when I go back to my patients, even though I've had a good deal of experience in working in intensive therapy, is still how I will keep my violin strings, my sensitivity, open at that end of the pole where I can experience him as a person, his suffering, desires, needs, potentialities and his anxiety and can genuinely want his welfare.

As I said, the desire to help leads into the desire to control. I'll plow, here, into more controversial aspects of my contribution. To my mind, one of the

dangers these days is a swing toward the tendency to control human behavior as a substitute for these things I have been talking about. I think one of several characteristics of our time is distrust of freedom, which is regarded as sentimentality; distrust of insight, and of autonomy. Our new emphasis on values, as I said in my previous paper, which in itself is sound, nevertheless tends easily to become and very often does become, to the student or patient, emphasis on the therapist's or counselor's values, or what is not much better, the society's values.

The student or the patient, in order to relieve his own anxiety, asks how the therapist or guidance counselor thinks he should live. He asks for this in many different ways and our belief in his possibilities of freedom and responsibility and autonomy in some ways must be the more courageous on our part because he cannot believe in them. The reason he's there is that he doubts them. It doesn't do any good to sit back and say, "You would like me to solve your problems but you are a free and responsible man, you are here to solve them." He doesn't know what that means, because he is not a free and responsible man. That means that the odds will always be against his belief in freedom and responsibility. The pressures for control by the therapist will be from the patient. He wants to be relieved from his anxiety.

Furthermore, the pressures from the culture are that "it takes too long" for somebody to become responsible. We've got to hurry up and get somebody established and successful in a job. These tendencies are most intricate in our culture. I think the tendency toward brainwashing is a social phenomenon of our times, not at all limited to prison camps. There are many aspects of our historical situation which push for conformist adjustment as a goal of therapy. The wide use of tranquilizers as crutches are evidence of the present tendency to purchase relief from anxiety by giving up individual freedom and consciousness. Other evidences are about us on all sides.

This leads me to discussion of a point of view with which I disagree, namely the conception of therapy and guidance as operant conditioning. I'm aware that some of you here believe in that point of view and I look forward to an interesting discussion. I want to quote here a paper that, from this point of view, is very good and poses some central questions very honestly and clearly -- a paper by Leonard Krasner, using Skinner's theory. The title of the paper is "The Therapist as Social Reinforcement Machine." The therapist is viewed as a social reinforcement machine who is programmed by prior training and experience. The task of the therapist is to manipulate and control the behavior of the patient. I don't mean to use the word "manipulate" here as a swearword. Krasner uses it as a legitimate aim. This doesn't change the fact that I radically disagree with it; but let us try to consider what is meant. Certainly one manipulates in medicine, one needs to, as when one sets a broken leg. Krasner does believe that this is one of the functions of a therapist. I emphatically do not. He then goes on to discuss brainwashing and placebo effects. He not only makes no distinction between these and psychotherapy but he says the placebo effect is the common element in all influencing processes. "In psychotherapy," to quote this paper, "there is a subtle manipulating of the patient's behavior by the therapist's reinforcing behavior, often without the awareness of either person that this is taking effect. This is the basic ingredient in the placebo effect." The therapist is the reinforcement in whom has been programmed the responses used in therapy. "Training represents the conscious efforts of a profession to program future therapists." The relation between the training supervisors and the candidate therapist has the characteristics of brainwashing, that is, the reduction of the candidates' anxiety by "changing their thinking" to conform with that of their captors.

One has to acknowledge that this happens all the time in therapy but I am here to say that I think this is a failure of therapy and not a success. This is the difference between Krasner and me.

I supervise students and colleagues, who are a few years younger than I am. I have a student now that was supervised by a classical Freudian and had learned that "brogue." He came to me about six weeks ago, and you could feel it in the air all over the place how much he wanted to learn my "brogue." I avoided my "brogue" as much as possible and also pointed out to him, "You might learn it but what good would it do you? If I am to be of any use to you at all, you must be the therapist you are." He had written up a case in the "brogue" of the other therapist, to which I had a rather skeptical reaction. This was because it sounded a little too much as if he were working on the theory that if you have enough imprints on you, somehow you find your own style. This is the way you don't find your own.

I realize how much of a temptation there is in therapy, and how tremendously open our powers are, to brainwash. I was discouraged with this student, but I must say I was awfully happy when, after a month or so of steadfastly pointing out to him how he wanted to be brainwashed, he brought a tape of a session which gave me some scientific ecstasy. He had caught something of his own and I must say I got that tremendous feeling we get as teacher, when somebody catches fire. I get nauseated by hearing my own terminology thrown back at me, but it's a marvelous feeling to experience a patient or student finding his own style which emerges out of his own being. Something grows -- a plant sticks its head up on a nice spring day and there it is. You know that no matter what you do, short of butchering it, this plant is going to grow.

Not only should therapeutic training not be brainwashing, it can't be. Adjustable people don't make the best therapists. This is why we do not pick, in our Psychoanalytic Institute, the best-adjusted candidates as students. God save us from too well-adjusted therapists and counselors. Krasner points out that the patients who are the most compliant, the most susceptible to hypnosis and those

with conforming tendencies, as shown on Barron's scale, are significantly the most conditionable. (This is not the kind of person that makes a good therapist.) The converse of the above seems inescapably implied to me, namely that non-conformist and independent trends in the patient, creativity and originality, are trained out in the operant conditioning approach. I regard the placebo effect of operant conditioning as the failure of therapy rather than its success. I look forward with great interest to the time when there will be patients who have been worked with over a period of time with this method. I am willing now to predict that you will find that what is never genuinely considered in the conditioning approach is human decision which involves always a negative as well as a positive will. Thus I expect a reaction against the conditioning. I would expect that, whenever you have adjustment as such without the consciousness of the person being centrally involved, you will have a later reaction.

I believe also that in neurosis itself, you have a reaction against exactly such an "adjustment without consciousness." For example, a neurotic may have been a child who, at a period in his life when he could not be conscious of what was going on because of his lack of psychological power, was brainwashed by parents who said they loved him when they were hating him, etc. This can result in the impoverishment of affect which goes along with the blocking off of potentiality, the dependence on authority, on compliance. This seems to me to be the neurosis which is characteristic of our time. If we recondition such patients, which we can do most easily, it seems to me that we simply substitute a culturally acceptable form of neurosis for one that didn't work.

I want to propose a thesis here on which you can do research -- I hope some of you will do research on this; I hope to do some myself. The thesis is: mental health is the capacity to be aware of the gap between stimulus and response and to use this awareness constructively. This thesis is at the exact opposite end of

the spectrum from conditioning and control. This thesis presupposes, as I have already said in my principles which have to do with symbolism, etc., that the human being has the capacity to be aware of a gap between stimulus and response and in this pause to cast his weight toward one response among a number of possibilities. This is true except for those S-R which are immediate by definition, like the startle reaction. I am not discussing this kind of thing; what I am discussing is what we deal with in counseling and therapy.

That gap between stimulus and response may be a matter of just a fraction of a second, but it is not a question of the amount of time or of waiting or of being instantaneous. With students you have in guidance, it may be the capacity for them to pause over periods of time, as in engagement and marriage problems, and to bear the anxiety of this gap, since it is the gap in which the anxiety occurs, and then to cast their weight on one possibility among several.

Let me illustrate from an experience of Bruno Bettelheim in the concentration camp. I do this, of course, out of my own imagination but I'm sure Bettelheim would agree with it. The SS-men slapped Bettelheim. In outside life the immediate automatic response, if someone slapped me, would be to slap him back. This is certainly what I would have done at two and a half years of age. We don't slap in civilized adult life but in any case that is the automatic response. In this concentration camp, if a man was slapped, his automatic reaction would not be to slap back but rather it would be the automatic reaction of humiliation and then resignation into a greater hopelessness. The prisoner wants to get to that response of resignation as quickly as possible because he cannot tolerate the gap. If he can immediately go into resignation he won't need to feel the humiliation. To tolerate the gap, to experience the fact that he is the man slapped is too painful. Bettelheim, however, and you and I, could be aware at that moment why we are not reacting to the blow by slapping the SS-man back again and this awareness which would occur almost instantaneously would then prevent our anger from

being turned into greater despair; this then would make it possible for the anger to be used constructively. The capacity to tolerate the gap would mean that one could still experience oneself as a man being slapped and also know that it is for one's survival, if you want to put it in those terms, that one tolerates this humiliation -- or, really, tolerates the gap; the humiliation is not tolerated, as that is an inside matter. Then Bettelheim or you or I could hang on to an image of ourselves, myself as a man I experience, with the awareness of being a person of greater dignity than the SS-man who slaps.

Bettelheim describes this in terms of the "ultimate freedom consciously to choose the attitude by which you will react to any given condition." This is a quote from him, at a point where someone is going to be put to death. It may well be that you and I or any man might be at the point where he would be put to death, with nothing whatever we could do about it; we will be shot in five minutes. The most important thing of all, says Bettelheim, we could do about it -- we could choose how we will react to this fact. He came out of this camp so you can be sure he's not talking sentimentally here. He is speaking of what both he and I believe to be the essence of a human being.

Let me briefly here, realizing that it may not be clear to you, give you an illustration from my own practice of how this works out in therapy. The patient was a woman in her middle forties, who had the problem of phobia and hysterical anxiety. She couldn't drive a car anymore, she couldn't go into crowds without tremendous terror. Her husband is an actor. She could not go to his openings; she had to be brought, as a matter of fact, to the sessions. She had two previous therapists who helped her but she still had her phobia. She said she had learned a good bit from them, but one therapist had been too enchanted by her. She was an enchanting woman, I knew this would be a danger right off the bat. She said the other therapist was too intellectual, and so they simply discussed. Her pattern all her life had been to give herself over to a drama teacher to let him mold her.

She became very good, then on opening night she would faint.

From this session I want only to mention a dream. The dream was: the mother had a big gash in her forehead and the patient was trying to go for bandages, tried to find a drugstore. Then the patient came to another older woman whom she had known and had cared for; this other woman was looking at the photograph of the patient. She came back with the bandages but the mother's gash now was small and the mother refused her help. We talked about the dream. It was very clear that this gash had to do with the symbol of birth through the forehead and as this person was very intelligent, I assumed that she knew the mythological reference. I asked: Did that occur to you? She said: Oh, yes. But I'm good at that symbolic stuff. I knew your way was not along those lines, always talking about archetypes and all that stuff so I left it out. Within the dream she is trying to make her mother the responsible one. The patient had devoted her life from her moment of awareness on, to making up to her mother for her brother who had died. Her mother was a highly dominating woman and had conditioned her well. Later on in the hour I said to her: "You have mentioned that one of the therapists was too intellectual and the other was enchanted by you. Didn't you really want to enchant him? Aren't you doing the same thing with me? You ferret out what you think I want." (Incidentally, she was entirely wrong about my not being interested in symbols. Nobody is more interested in symbols than I am; but the significant thing is how she distorts that.) As I will indicate later, the symbol has its own power, and the symbol should be used for its power in therapy rather than to talk about. "You're doing the same thing with me," I said, "trying to fit what you think I want, letting me mold you, and then at the last moment, to protect yourself, you'll faint. You'll defeat me, also, if I mold you."

At that point terror came into her eyes, the same kind of terror you would see in the eyes of a deer who is in mortal danger and wants to run away. The terror arose from the fact that I had hit at an automatic conditioned system,

psychoanalytically called a defense. But it is much more than a mechanism of defense. I had hit at the whole way of life which had enabled her to survive as a child and later on. I added then that to preserve her own self she had to defeat the persons who molded her, such as drama teachers. At the end of the hour I said, with respect to the dream: "You had the woman whom you really cared for looking at your photograph. Isn't that what you've done all your life, given a picture of yourself, rather than your real self? You've gone through life playing a role, a facsimile of yourself, believing others wouldn't admire you for what you genuinely want to do; for example, the mother refused your help. To be loved what you have done is give this facsimile. You haven't really put yourself into life at all." (These things always sound corny outside the context.) What I said at the time was phrased in her words, and was effective in that now a new anxiety came into her eyes. This was the experience of the gap of awareness. The first terror was the breaking of the automatic response. This new anxiety at the end of the hour showed in her behavior. She stopped, pondered, she looked up at me once or twice, and then down at the floor to let it sink in. And then she looked up at me and said: "That's terribly meaningful," and left. (A nice exit line for an hour of therapy.)

I tell you this so truncatedly to point out the nature of the anxiety experienced in this gap, when the old stimulus-response system is broken. There is first the terror of being disoriented -- the world is not as it was; the world is overturned, a no-man's land. This is loss of the experience, for the moment, of self and world; if this goes on over a relatively long period of time you have schizophrenia. All of us have to tolerate it for short periods of time. In this gap anxiety takes place. It is the anxiety of freedom; as Kierkegaard says, it's the dizziness of freedom. As long as the patient's automatic pattern worked, she didn't feel anxiety. She carried on the way her mother had brainwashed her.

The student in guidance or the patient can take the first kind of anxiety, which is terrifically painful, precisely because there is another person in his world. He can do it by virtue of a relationship. This is why you are so important to the other person even though you do not come up with bright ideas and this sort of thing. The second kind of anxiety is a constructive kind. When the patient saw that she went through life with people looking at her photograph, this was another stimulus-response gap but a constructive one and one that could be constructively faced. I call this the gap of insight. It was the gap that made possible the bringing together of what went on when she was a child of three with her mother and what goes on now, only now she can be aware of it, let it at least sink in, and sooner or later be changed. Her reaction there was that it was meaningful, rather than "Damn it all, what the hell am I paying you for, why don't you relieve me?"

Hopefully the student or patient can reconstruct, begin possibly with the recent stuff, put a new stone in the reconstruction of his experience of himself in relation to the world in a way which is according to his nature.

Incidentally, if you want to use some of our tough words in philosophy, this is the anxiety of non-being in the undercutting that she experienced. The second anxiety is the reaction of non-being also but, from the point of view of being, which makes all the difference in the world. I use the words that Kierkegaard uses.

I believe that in this gap between stimulus-response, under whatever name one chooses to use for these aspects of experience, there occurs not only anxiety but symbolization. Within this gap the symbolic experience is significant. You may be familiar with the work of Hobart Mowrer. With many of his ideas I find myself in disagreement, but his work on symbolism in learning theory is, I think, of tremendous importance. He starts with the idea of drives, hunger and sex, but then goes on to indicate in a very intricate development in his book on symbolism

and learning that actually what has happened to human beings is that practically never except in extreme cases of pathology do you have a case of sex and hunger drives as such. Hunger, rather, becomes symbolically interpreted and understood so that then the issue becomes, with human beings, will they make \$6,000 or 16,000? The issue becomes prestige, house, status, security. If you try to think back, when was the issue with you ever hunger as a primary drive? Practically never is this the case. The drive moves into a symbol; sex does also.

What we deal with in counseling and therapy is the symbolic experience that includes the drive but now it has a very different form. Take a simple example: the flag. All of you who have traveled, or been in a foreign country for three or four years know that, even if you look down on the American Legion and all that kind of stuff, you can see a Turkish or Greek flag, an Egyptian flag, an American flag. The others are signs. The American flag is not. It is a piece of cloth, but still moves something in you of tremendous importance. God, truth, a student football player, the most popular girl, a teacher, used as an ideal, and so on -- all of these symbols are ways of bringing together unconscious levels with conscious levels. The word symbol means "to throw or to draw together" and a symbol is a way of uniting unconscious and conscious experience, individual and group experience, immediate and the historic experience.

Does anybody know what the antonym of symbolic is? I spent some time with some scholars going over this, and they traced it back. It's not in the dictionary, but the antonym to symbolic is diabolic. Diabolic means "to tear apart." It's amazing that in the historic development of language there is reflected what I believe to be the difference between good and evil -- namely, the diabolic, devilish, satanic aspects of life are those which tear apart, and the symbolic are those which integrate or give meaning, those which draw together.

Symbols and myths, which are the same thing in a different form, of course, are what we never study in psychology unfortunately, although they are of the

essence of human experience. The book I studied in my psychology course in college, by Dr. Woodworth at Columbia, published in 1928, doesn't even have the word 'symbol' or 'myth' in the index. I believe that these symbolic processes are the essence of what goes on in human experience, and of what we are dealing with in therapy and counseling. Yet they should never be discussed as such in counseling. You have to work with the student's symbols, but you have to deal with symbols as the source of power in themselves. I didn't get hung up, in the session of my case cited above, in talking about Zeus and the birth of Athena; I didn't even mention it beyond asking her whether she had it in mind. The tendency to intellectualize symbols is a misunderstanding and misuse of them.

If a student comes in with his symbol or ideal model, a football player, you must work with the power that is in that symbol. You may help him to make this more useful for his life, more integrative for him. He may be the water boy who tags around after the football player, as did one of my patients while at Exeter. This water boy, admiring the big boys, developed a tremendous slyness at causing everybody else's downfall. The need for strength had not led to his integration; it was the need for grandiose power, which later led him to alcoholism, because when he was drunk he could feel like the football players.

One must take the symbol with the power that is given in it. I propose to you that in guidance you respect the student's symbols, even though one may happen to be Marilyn Monroe or Mae West, because the symbols have within them what is trying to grow but is impoverished or blocked at some point in the student's life. Since last week, when I was putting together these notes, a phrase from Kierkegaard kept running through my mind, "Potentiality moves into actuality but the intermediate determinant is anxiety." I was thinking of Dr. Tiedeman's remark about self-actualization and other things in the papers that we were reading when I kept thinking of this sentence, but the way I kept reading it in my mind was "potentiality moves into actuality but the immediate

determinant is the symbol." Or if we use Dr. Kagan's view, the intermediate determinant is the ideal model. Potentiality in relation to the self, to the world, etc., moves into actuality and the intermediate determinant is the process that is characterized on one side by anxiety, on the other side by symbolic experience.

In closing let me say a few words about Dr. Kagan's ideal model. I was very excited when I read his paper because he was giving some empirical concrete data which proved what I believed; but we psychotherapists have an awful time getting data that is convincing to anybody but ourselves. It's very hard to translate our data into psychological language that looks like anything. I don't feel, incidentally, that that means our data is in the slightest degree less significant. The data we now get from my consulting room, whether you like my saying this or not, is, I think, the data you are going to be able to prove, to demonstrate in academic psychology in 20 years. Jerry Kagan has proven some of it already -- that the symbolic process, the ideal model is there between potentiality and actuality. I don't like the term "cognitive," as I've already told him. To me that term connotes processes that are too intellectual and too conscious. I think that precisely the power of models is that they are much more than cognitive. Like the symbol, they indicate unconscious levels and levels that should not fully be made conscious. They do not need to be levels which arise from the bodily functions, although they make these conscious; they unite these with consciousness. Always a polarity goes on. The cognitive has historically been set up in contrast to the conative, which means endeavor, will, impulse, wish. I think the symbol is what unites cognitive and conative.

Dr. Tiedeman says one problem which inheres in Dr. Kagan's ideal model is that it still tends too much to come from the outside. I agree with Dr. Tiedeman. I think that is because all of us are under the pressure of formulating things psychologically and it's awfully difficult to formulate something when you need the subjective pole that is really beyond our formulations at the moment. Perhaps

this is a good point to close on.

The potentialities which we deal with mostly in therapy are those which are blocked off. How does the individual experience them? Potentialities come out of the person as person, body as body, person as social creature, and I think it is the inside, subjective dimension of these which we must bring back into the picture. Let me give you a very simple example. My son was six or seven when he and I used to take walks up in New Hampshire on our little farm. It was most engaging to watch this little boy taking pleasure in walking. You could see from how he moved his arms and legs and from the expression on his face that it gave him real pleasure. He used to look at his shadow with some delight, at his reflection, as though feeling, "How good it is to move." I said nothing at all about this, of course, and he said nothing to me. It's very important that we didn't as this is the intimate kind of thing you experience in each other like nakedness.

What I am referring to cannot be put under the rubric of competence, of rivalry, or mastery or any other of these things we can work with in academic psychology and do work with well. Robert White's ideas of competence I appreciate very much, but there is something else that we have left out. Potentialities have their own joy, regardless of competence. Regardless of whether I'm a better or worse tennis player there is a joy in the feel and swing of a tennis racket. I want then to bring back into the picture of potentiality the subjective experiences of all of these potentialities which may lead later into self-actualization but have their own value as inwardly experienced. You and I may call what I'm talking about, when we do it, because we are selfconscious about this kind of stuff, "fun" -- "it is fun to swing or dance." But the real term for it is "joy." It is distinguished from all these other things that we can measure much more easily on scales, like happiness or success. "Joy" is the experience of the actualization of potentiality.

Let me give as my last sentence (I would be sad if I didn't give it to you): I think a central function of the guidance counselor and the therapist is to be a

midwife. The concept comes from Socrates, "A person committed to the birth process in the other person." The laws, the dynamics, the creative process come from the other person -- the student or the patient. The midwife is fully present at every moment, devoted to the birth, ready to assist, completely responsible, but always with the realization that the birth comes from the other person. The midwife must have the delicate sense of when not to interfere, to let it be born. The therapist must likewise have the delicate sense of when to keep out of the way. Kierkegaard said: "How rare the magnanimity of a helper who can be sufficiently concerned with the other person that he is willing to be not the cause but the occasion for the other's self-realization."

DISCUSSION

Comment: We're going to have to make some kind of judgment regarding what is "good" -- or "healthy" -- for the patient or client. Dr. May would make a judgment on the basis of his speculation about the theory of man. I think it's a very defensible position. Science hasn't determined what is the nature of man, neither have the philosophers. We really have to make a value judgment then.

Comment: Nothing can help me to accept that. The patient may not be at all amenable to that kind of thing. You would almost have to convert him to your opinion before you operate with him.

R. May: I certainly don't believe you have to convince the student or patient of your position. I was trying to indicate in my remarks this morning that I think that's exactly the trouble with our systems of psychotherapy. The problem you describe is very reasonable and it arises, as you said, out of the fact that the world of the counselor and the patient is not identical at all. It's not identical, but it doesn't have to be. I don't think any two worlds are. There are points of overlap where you can understand each other. My job with the patients and your job with the counselees is to find some areas in which you can understand each other. Otherwise you'd have to convert him, which is exactly what I deny.

Comment: The point is not where you do, but where you don't overlap.

R. May: Certainly there are places in therapy and counseling where you have to make judgments. My point is that those judgments must be out in the open. There is a certain point where you must exert some control. This, however, should be in the awareness of both counselor and client. Everything that goes on in the way of influence must be open and constant; I think this is the radical difference between therapy conversion and what I described this morning as operant conditioning. Dr. Hirning, could you give a reaction to this, in terms of the problem of understanding between the counselor's and student's world.

C. Hirning: I think the counselor is constantly faced with the problem of anxiety and guilt in schools and certainly the counselor's awareness of when this is insufferable, when it is pathological, or normal, or whether the anxiety is part of a continuum -- one end is boredom, the other end is panic -- there may be a continuum there. The counselor may have to draw on his own experience. We do not know the answer in terms of a rulebook but the thing is we question and wonder and try to deal with things as they come.

R. May: How does one distinguish between normal and neurotic anxiety, between normal and neurotic guilt, how does one train school counselors to know the difference, or must we be content in counselor education to develop in training a little more than a humble attitude regarding this difficult question? I think it is possible to learn a good bit about anxiety. In my book on anxiety I distinguished neurotic anxiety as anxiety which is inappropriate to the situation; it is met, dealt with by the person with some form of repression, and results in some form of symptoms. These may not be the symptoms we get in psychotherapy but may be inability to study or things of that sort. I think boredom in our culture is very often a symptom of chronic repressed

anxiety, especially in our difficult world situation. People get apathetic; the present apathy in our culture seems to be a general cultural symptom of unfaced anxiety about the fact that we may be blown off the earth tomorrow. Neurotic anxiety does not have creative results (constructive results). Normal anxiety is the reverse of those things. It is appropriate to the situation; our present anxiety about the world situation or that of the student that he might fail an exam is normal. He might fail, and this better be faced. Facing it does not lead to repression or symptom formation and also normal anxiety can be and ought to be used constructively. Normal anxiety is creative; it opens the way to creative possibilities, occurs only at points where some creative choice is possible. I think neurotic anxiety is the end result of unfaced normal anxiety. The child was not able to face the normal anxiety early in life, then had to begin the process that results ultimately in neurotic anxiety. Our job as therapists and to some extent as counselors is to help the person transmute his neurotic anxiety into normal anxiety. See what he is really afraid of and then see how this can be used constructively.

Question: Is there any possibility at all of thinking in terms of a counseling relationship with the client where neurotic anxiety has never crept in, where constructive anxiety is right there, present. And we work with this individual to avoid the possibility of his having neurotic anxiety?

R. May: For practical purposes, I think this may frequently occur. It doesn't mean that the student may not have neurotic anxiety in some other area, but on a particular problem the anxiety may be relatively normal. And you work with it so he doesn't have to retrench or fight his fear or pull back. I think it's a good statement.

By and large, you see, counseling ought to deal with normal anxiety. But you ought to be able to recognize neurotic anxiety and you may be able to, to some extent.

J. Kagan: It always bothers me when you get off on this thing of threatening anxiety, then you talk of normal and neurotic as representing a difference involving intensity. Yet when we ask anyone in guidance whether they do exactly what they say you should do, namely, look over the overt behavior, they say that this is what they do. If so, you really infer anxiety. Is this set of responses giving the individual difficulty? We know so little about the dynamics of the establishment of this behavior it is absolutely fallacious to assume that an ulcer reflects "more intense anxiety" than academic retardation. And so when we discuss it at this level it is superfluous to talk about the intensity of anxiety. What is really pertinent is the degree to which a set of responses interferes with adaptive living in the particular milieu in which it is found.

R. May: Yes, but isn't it true that that is the distinction between neurotic and normal anxiety; it is the extent to which the anxiety interferes. Neurotic anxiety interferes radically with one's, what you call adaptive behavior. I wouldn't want to call it that, but I know what you mean and it's clear, I would say, that it cannot be used constructively, whereas normal anxiety can be used thusly. I didn't use the word "intense", Jerry. We feel it as a qualitative difference; I don't think it's a matter of intensity.

Question: May I break in? Twice now we've discussed the concept of the continuum. Dr. Hirning introduced it as boredom at one end and panic at the other. Somewhere along the continuum there is a qualitative change. This

affects overt behavior. Whether or not you call it "intensity", there is a change in what you call normal to neurotic anxiety. What, therefore, are the signs that indicate the distinction between them along the continuum?

R. May: I think that would be the point at which anxiety cannot be faced.

J. Kagan: How is that determined in terms of overt behavior?

R. May: I disagree with your approach. It's not overt behavior. I quote your paper here and Dr. Tiedeman's remark "overt behavior is always ambiguous". I think that is extremely important. Your compulsive-obsessional patient doesn't show overt signs of anxiety. Those whom I have as my patients in therapy often don't show much; they've got it nicely structured. One has certainly to look much more profoundly. I wouldn't say you just judge the overt behavior.

Wouldn't you agree with me that the sign, the chief thing you would be concerned with, is whether or not the student can confront the problem that he brings, the problem that he faces without having to block off the impact, the significance of it? Would you agree or would you not?

J. Kagan: That would be enough probably. I know of cases, I'm sure you do, too, of students facing it in an annoying, agonizing way. All this anxiety may have at least one more characteristic besides the direct confrontation of the anxiety with all of its intensity.

Comment: There is a question of whether or not "anxiety" is a relevant term for the tensions and the stimulation and the dissatisfaction with the status quo which a creative person may show while normally functioning in a normal, accepted area.

If we decide, as I think some of us have decided by this time, that the tension-reduction model isn't really appropriate, I don't think we need the term "anxiety" to account for the desire for stimulation, the desire for activity, for motility, so to speak which seems to be a usual characteristic of "normal" human behavior. Why need it be described as "anxious"? Anxiety seems to take place where there is a perception on the part of the individual that some sort of alternative exists and there is no means of coping with it. In other words, a failure in some kind of coping mechanism -- "The abilities and resources that I have are not going to be appropriate to the situation which I somehow confront." Then anxiety makes its appearance.

R. May: But I would say that this situation, "I may not be able to cope", is a situation that normally arises a dozen times a day. Up here, the questions that are asked, I may not be able to cope with them, in a sense I have anxiety. This is normal anxiety, probably some neurotic, too, but certainly some normal.

Comment: I'd like to raise a question which I think is exceedingly practical for the counselor who deals with children. Such as those counselors who work in primary and secondary schools in Manhattan, where the question of interpretation of behavior is exceedingly important. Children don't often report "I am experiencing anxiety". They express it in their behavior. I think it's very important for counselors to be aware that certain behavior expresses anxiety.

FURTHER QUESTIONS FROM THE SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

In reference to the definition of mental health, is there not more than symbolization occurring in the gap between stimulus and response? (What of entire life situation and response to same?)

From your presentation we gather that the major source of inadequacy in counseling today is that it has drawn too heavily from a deterministic behavioral science, a science that twenty years from now may not be able to deal with significant problems. We gather, too, that you feel the counselor would more profitably turn not to the behavioral scientist but to the philosopher or theologian.

The history of science and human affairs is littered with truths that have been proven to be invalid. We know that the experience that something is valid is not the guarantee that it will turn out to be valid. In specific issues of guidance, counseling, and psychotherapy, one is constantly faced with the problem of deciding between one conception of truth or another. For instance, there are some therapists who would claim that operant conditioning technique would be effective in the removing of phobia without harmful side effects and others would dispute this. How would you determine which is valid truth?

SOME IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH IN PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT
FOR COUNSELOR EDUCATION

51

Jerome Kagan

Being convinced that most of you have indeed read the texts of last Spring, I have spent the Christmas holiday trying to piece together a discussion that would be stimulating, yet not repetitive; theoretical, yet tied to the practical exigencies that confront the professional guidance person. I quickly realized that this was an impossible task. But somehow this realization made me first giddy, then emboldened me to present to you my view of personality development. Such a scheme will necessarily be sketchy. Happily the form of this Conference is such that we will have many hours for you -- as individuals or en masse -- to force me to fill in the lacunae in this scheme.

Then two happy things happened to me this morning. First, I was fortunate to have breakfast with Paul Clifford and I asked him what he sees as the role of the guidance counselor, because, as you all know, I don't have frequent contact with this group. He said very succinctly that the role of the guidance counselor is to help preadolescents and adolescents make decisions. Then it suddenly hit me that there was a close tie between what I was going to say and the mission of the guidance person; this eased my apprehension about speaking this afternoon. I think the concept of models and the concept of self-labeling and identification are intimately bound up with the problem of decision making. To preview one of the kernels in the material I am about to present, I think that very important in the decision-making process are the earnest attempts of young people to match their image of behavior to that of some idealized model.

The second happy thing was that I realized more completely what Rollo May meant when he said to me informally last night and on Saturday that he saw a tie, or many ties, between his point of view and his thinking during the past years and my paper in Chicago. It became clear to me this morning for the first time what he meant by the term "being vs. non-being," or his mystic phrase "midwife."

I can now see that there is great communality -- perhaps not identity, but large degree of overlap -- between his use of the word "being" this morning, or "midwife," and what I mean by "a model," "an ideal model," "a set of standards." If it will help as I talk this next hour and a half perhaps you might use this translation -- when I am using the word "standards," I think in large measure it is related to Rollo's term "being."

As I indicated last night, the presentation has a major and a minor theme. The major theme is a broad sketch of personality development and its relation to certain problems. Perhaps if there are burning questions on this I can stop because the minor theme is small. It contains my ramblings and suggestions about what the future training of guidance people should be.

Let's first turn to the theoretical view of personality development. Personality is a funny word that prompts lengthy and controversial definitions. In fact though, it refers merely to those motives, behaviors, and attitudes for which we expect and find marked individual differences. Typically, we do not expect dramatic differences in visual or auditory acuity and do not call acuity a personality trait. If indeed this characteristic did vary widely among individuals we might begin to regard it as a personality disposition. People differ in their attributes, both internal and external, as a result of the time patterned social experiences to which they have been exposed and their own physical and stimulus attributes. This broad statement is not of much help until we add some substance to the phrases "time patterned, social experience," and "personal and stimulus attributes."

An emphasis on the timing of interpersonal events stems from the important notion of critical periods in human development. The concept of a critical period has been borrowed from biology, where it had a sound, theoretical home. In brief, it means that a certain experience impinging on an organism at time

t will have one kind of an effect, while the same experience impinging at another time -- say $t + 1$ year -- would have little or perhaps no effect. A second notion independent but implicit in the concept of critical periods is that certain processes -- anatomical organs for the biologist, responses for the psychologist -- are developing at a maximal rate during one time period in contrast to another. Any interference with the development of that process during that period will have a great effect on the future integrity of the organism; while an identical or similar intervention at another time will have negligible consequences. I believe the concept of critical period is applicable to psychology if we substitute for the concept of the anatomical organ the concept of the psychological response. If a mother contracts German measles during the first trimester of her pregnancy, the probability of her child having central nervous system defect is enhanced considerably, because the central nervous system is developing most rapidly during this nine week period. However, because of the slower growth of the central nervous system during the last 12 weeks the same environmental event has little effect on this organ. I would like to view psychological development in terms of critical periods and talk about the rapid growth of certain response systems during certain time periods. From Erikson's intriguing discussion of the life cycle, I would suggest that during the first year of life the child is learning, among other things, the response of trusting other people, of expecting to be nurtured or punished, of expecting pleasure or pain from human beings. This is the time when this disposition is proceeding most rapidly and interference with it at this time -- such as might occur by placing the child in an institution -- may seriously alter the future form of this important social behavior. From 12 to 24 or 30 months of life the child stands up, begins to locomote and begins to try to gratify his needs for autonomy and mastery. Excessive restriction or excessive permissiveness during this period is also apt to have greater consequences for future behavior than over restriction or under control during the tenth year of life. During the

preschool years and first year or two of school, several important processes are going on, simultaneously, of course, the most important of which is the "process of identification" with parent figures. We all have more to say of this later. During the first four years of school the child encounters two new socializing agents -- the teacher and the peer group -- and begins to court their acceptance. Their reactions toward him are going to have a much greater effect on his self concept and future behavior than their reactions toward him two years earlier or five years hence. A second important response process developing during this time is the child's striving to master those skills that are promoted and encouraged by this culture. Early and successful mastery of these skills makes the child's future work much easier, whereas failure during this five year period will have a permanent and perhaps irreversible effect upon his future mastery behavior. During the early adolescent years -- 11 to 15 -- the child is dealing with the problems of resolving independence upon his family, learning sexual attitudes and postures toward the opposite sex, trying to choose an adult role, and crystallizing ~~a phrase I like~~ -- "an ego identity."

The notion of a critical period is highly relevant for two common problems in the school age child -- academic motivation and asocial behavior. Recent empirical research from several laboratories -- some of which has come from our own institution -- is persuasive in indicating that the first 4 to 5 years of school are critical in determining the intensity of a striving to master academic tasks -- reading, writing, arithmetic, etc. In our own longitudinal study the child's degree of involvement in the school curricula in Grade 5 was an excellent predictor of future involvement in intellectual work throughout college and early adulthood. Many people are gradually recognizing that the beginning of academic impairment occurs long before high school and one of the primary functions of the elementary guidance person is a prophylactic one. This increased emphasis on ages 6-10 is

reasonable. The tasks to be mastered in school are cumulative, and each year of failure forces the child to use a withdrawal defense if he is to live with himself. For no child can tolerate the pain that follows continuous school failure with its concomitant teacher and peer rejection. There is only one defense open to the child -- that of withdrawal -- and the more frequently it is practiced, the stronger it becomes.

Asocial and delinquent behavior comprise a second class of problems for the guidance person. The hostility that mounts toward adults during the first ten years of life has a wall of suspicion and hatred as its advanced guard. There appears to be a critical thickness of this psychological wall beyond which its penetrability becomes either impossible or, at best, especially difficult. Those who labor with the problem report consistently that age 13 or 14 is too late for rehabilitation. For most of these children the therapeutic intervention must come earlier. Thus, work on the development of intellectual mastery behavior, asocial behavior, social anxiety, or dependency in normal children contains the message that the first 10 years of life are a critical period for the establishment of many salient adult behaviors. If we are to tailor a society of adults to desirable proportions, it is mandatory that we effect our changes early and insert sensitive spotters into the primary grades.

The conditions of development -- patterns of reward and punishment and psychological models.

A second set of conditions -- besides time patterned events -- influencing the development of the child involves those patterns of rewards and punishments to which he is exposed and the behavior and personality of the models which interact with him and which he chooses to emulate. Each caretaker praises and gives affection for the execution of certain responses -- he or she punishes -- through physical hurt or threatened withdrawal of love -- acts he or she wants to eliminate. There is no doubt that specific acts rewarded or punished affect the types of

behavior displayed by the child. However, we must not forget that the effect of such rewards and punishments is different depending on when in the developmental span they are introduced. Here we are calling once again upon the notion of a critical period. Maternal hostility during the ages 10-14 will result in a different effect than the same degree of hostility displayed during the first 3 or 4 years of life. We have recently discovered in our longitudinal population a phenomenon we have called the "sleeper effect." This phrase refers to the fact that a specific parental practice -- acceleration and rewarding of intellectual development let us say -- initiated during the first 3 years of life may have a profound effect on the child at age 14, whereas what appears to be a similar practice at age 6 has a minimal effect on the adolescent's behavior. There is a sleeper effect with early practices sometimes having a more profound influence on later behavior than a practice displayed closer in contiguity to the observed behavior in the child. What is our interpretation of this phenomenon? One explanation rests on the assumption that the reciprocal nature of the mother-child interaction changes with time. Specifically the child's stimulus salience -- that is his ability to provoke relatively permanent changes in specific maternal reactions toward him increases with age. A 6-year old is more likely to produce a major alteration in the mother's characteristic behavior toward the child than is a 2-year old. The mother-child dyad is a feedback system and the degrees to which the child's actions have the power to change the mother's behavior increases with development. A mother typically establishes expectations as to what her child should be like, the standards to which this behavior should conform. The greater the discrepancy between her expectations and her evaluation of the child, the greater the likelihood that she will modify her behavior and exert pressure on the child in an attempt to direct him toward greater congruence with her expectations. During infancy the child's personality is relatively ambiguous, and the discrepancy between her standard and what she perceives in the child is small.

The child is seen as an object primarily to be acted upon. The form and content of many maternal behaviors therefore are not as contaminated by the effect of the child's behavior on the mother as the behavior toward a 10-year old. To illustrate, a mother's concern with the intellectual mastery of the 2-year old is more likely an index of her basic needs than her degree of concern with the performance of her 10-year old who might be failing in school or doing very well. Mothers change their expectations as the child develops and the mother's lack of concern with the school progress of her 10-year old daughter who is failing could be a recently acquired defense maneuver to protect the mother from disappointment. Similarly, encouragement of independence, a critical attitude, or over protection toward an 11-year old may be newly developed reactive measures to a child's excessive dependence, excessive rebelliousness, or fragile defenses. The maternal behaviors we found to display the sleeper effect most strongly were maternal protection and maternal hostility, especially toward daughters. An extremely protective attitude was characteristic of mothers who wished to infantilize their children. A critical attitude was characteristic of mothers who wanted early autonomy and independence from their daughters. The daughters of these two groups of mothers developed personalities that were congruent with their mother's expectations. The daughters of protective mothers were, as adults, passive, afraid of social interaction, noncompetitive, and involved in traditional feminine interests. The daughters of critical mothers achieved early independence from the family and retained this orientation through adulthood. We are not suggesting that all research on parent-child relations be longitudinal. There are, however, specific classes of parent-child interactions that are vulnerable to the sleeper effect. These include maternal behaviors that are likely to change in frequency over the first decade such as physical affection, reward of dependency, physical punitiveness, and acceleration. On the other hand, there are maternal behaviors that tend to be stable such as attitude toward sexuality, attitude toward the appropriate-

ness of traditional sex typed traits. We might suggest that the initiation of a series of a 6-year study in which the mother's behavior during the first three would be correlated with the child's behavior during the first 6 might turn out to be a wise and profitable research strategy.

There is one clear implication of this finding. Educators, psychologists, and guidance personnel often speak with parent groups in the inevitable question-answer period that follows a discussion. In such a discussion period the speaker is faced with questions like "My boy hits squirrels with stones, what shall I do?" Such a question reflects a point of view about time and causality in human behavior that is lifted from the physical sciences but is not always applicable to the life sciences, especially psychology. You can stop a heavy object in motion by obstructing it with the right mass at any time. You can accelerate a moving body at any time by applying the proper force. However, you cannot change a child's aggressive behavior at age 10 by applying a specific practice or restriction that should have been applied 8 years earlier. The public must come to appreciate that there are hysteresis phenomena in human development and once a warp has formed in the behavioral system it is not easily smothered or straightened. A knowledgeable appreciation of cause-effect sequences over long periods of time must be communicated to parents and teachers in a way much more sophisticated than we are accustomed to.

The use of models.

A second function of social agents is that they function as models -- they behave in certain ways and are viewed as desirable or undesirable by children. I would like to emphasise this function of a social agent for two reasons. First, I believe that the parent or adult as a model is more important in shaping the behavior of the child than is his pattern of rewards and punishments. Since this phenomenon is less well understood than the way in which rewards and punishments change the child's behavior, there is an advantage in dwelling upon it. Second,

interpretation is less satisfying than viewing this difference as a result of a choice of different models. The lower class boy believes that to be an adult male one must have many sexual conquests. Such conquests become a defining characteristic of the adult male in the belief system of the lower class adolescent. Thus, the differential frequency of sexual behavior is often a reflection of differences in the perception of those responses that define the ideal model for lower versus middle class boys.

In sum, the same act -- be it aggression or sex -- cannot be interpreted correctly unless one knows the model the individual has chosen to emulate, or we might say, unless one knows the cognitive system to which the behavior is linked. Let us now return to the main theme, which is a description of the basic constructs in the cognitive system. I suggest we first have wishes or, to use a more popular term, motives. I would emphasize, for our culture, wishes -- desires for power, task mastery, hostility, love, nurturance, social recognition, social acceptance, sexual stimulation, a desire to regard one's thoughts and behaviors as rational and consistent, and a desire to make one's behavior conform to one's previously learned standards. If the standards are based primarily on the norms for the culture then the motive becomes a desire to make one's behavior conform to that of a reference group.

A second set of constructs deals with the expectations of anxiety and unpleasant affect; specifically expectations of acceptance or rejection, of failure or success, of guilt, of punishment, of physical harm, of non-existence.

A third set deals with cognitive defenses -- mental tricks that are effective in reducing anxiety. Here we refer to Anna Freud's description of the classic mechanisms of defense -- repression, projection, denial, intellectualization, and rationalization.

A fourth set of cognitive constructs refers to the language labels the individual applies to himself, to his wishes, to others, and to objects and events.

These labels often have a strong evaluative component, and the work of Osgood and his colleagues suggests that three critical labels widely used in the labeling of others involve the dimensions of good-bad, strong-weak, active-passive. Allow me the liberty to go one step beyond these data and suggest that Osgood's work implies three basic dimensions or three basic questions the individual asks about himself: "Am I good or bad, am I competent or incompetent, and am I masculine or feminine, (i.e., do I have an appropriate or inappropriate sex role identity)?"

A fifth set of cognitive constructs refers to rules of knowledge we have learned that allow us to act upon our perceptions and categorizations and to solve problems (e.g., that table is four feet wide and six feet long, its area must be 24 square feet).

The last major class of constructs involves the affects. Those that appear to be central for human behavior are (a) anxiety over physical harm, over loss of love, over a negative self label, over deviation from one's standards. (b) Joy and pleasure, (c) anger, (d) excitement, and I would include here sexual excitement and (e) guilt and depression.

This then is the broad mural I like to use when talking about and describing human behavior. It is obvious that we cannot probe deeply into all aspects of this broad scheme in a reasonable length of time. I have chosen, therefore, two domains for careful study -- self labels and the wish for a consonant sex role identity. I select these processes because I have thought most about them during the past five years and because they are of significance for the pathologies the guidance person confronts.

Self labels.

An inevitable outcome of development is the acquisition of an interlocking series of labels about the self. Some of these labels are unconscious, others agonizingly available to conscious inventory. The labels deal with physical attributes such as height and weight, skills and weaknesses, religious, ethnic and

family identifications. Unfortunately, many of these labels have an implicit or often explicit evaluative component with one end good and the other bad. These involve dimensions such as intellectually competent vs. intellectually incompetent, strong or fragile, aggressive or nonaggressive, independent and autonomous vs. dependent and passive, sexually exciting vs. sexually nonexciting, pretty or attractive vs. homely and unattractive, loved by others vs. unloved, powerful or not powerful, sex role appropriate vs. inappropriate.

The degree of positive or negative value attached to a certain behavior is determined, in large measure, by the values of the models to whom he has been exposed. If a child or adolescent regards aggression as "bad" he will strive to behave in a nonaggressive way and to avoid acts that have an aggressive or competitive flavor. For the child wants consonance with the values of the idealized model. In the earlier paper, I discussed how this process affects academic mastery. For example, when the child is exposed to powerful adults who are excessively aggressive and hostile to him, he may label these models as negative and regard social agents who have power as undesirable models. In this way he comes to regard power as an undesirable attribute. The child is apt to develop an idealized model whose primary characteristic is reluctance to exercise arbitrary power over others. Such a child will want to possess a self label that implies the absence of power characteristics and such a child avoids the assumption of power roles. In one case with which we are familiar, the child suffered chronic rejection from peers who had power and prestige in his immediate social environment. In order to rationalize the feeling of anxiety over his own lack of status with his peers, he disavowed an interest in social power. During his college years when a motivation for academic competence became linked in a rational way to preparation for a vocation, this young man became highly motivated to perfect his academic skills and he began to get good grades. However, in his college milieu such excellence led quickly to social power. He was nominated for

status positions and participated in power-linked activities. He dimly recognized that his efforts in academic mastery resulted in the attainment of power and soon an inhibition on academic effort developed. This inhibition was due, in large measure, to a lack of congruence between the behavior dictated by the idealized model he wanted to be, and the self label that he was acquiring as a result of his academic excellence.

A similar process involves other self labels, say, a self label regarding submission. Many students block on academic work because of a fear that such activity is synonymous with the acquisition of the self label passive and submissive. Let us explain how this might develop. Many middle class parents take intellectual mastery as one of the bases for parental acceptance. The young child strives for grades in order to gain the love and approval of his parents. Any situation in which approval is contingent upon the school mastery leads to the equating of mastery efforts with submission to adult wishes. As young adulthood approaches the adolescent becomes anxious if he views himself as overly submissive to parental or authority demands. The young male especially, regards the traits of autonomy, self determination, and independence from parents as self labels he desires to possess. The model he has established does not permit the obsequious seeking of adult approval or submission to parents. Such an adolescent may become anxious if he believes that he is courting parental acceptance through academic excellence -- if he regards academic mastery as a submissive posture vis a vis his family. Although there are rational and mature reasons for expending effort in college, the association cluster involving effort at mastery, parental acceptance, and passivity can lead to anxiety over being passive to parental demands and to a subsequent inhibition of any striving for mastery. These students behave as if they will not exercise a certain behavior because someone wants them to. They are suspicious of their motives and feel that their studying is motivated by a need for approval, dismissing the fact that they in fact do have realistic reasons for such efforts.

A third dynamic involving self labels and mastery involves hostility. This becomes clear when striving for academic excellence becomes associated with hostility toward peers and the individual subsequently becomes anxious over these hostile thoughts. During elementary and high school academic excellence is too often enmeshed in a competitive context. In order to obtain good grades the child must do better than his peers and this leads to wishes that peers will fail. Such wishes may also lead to the expectation that the peer will feel unhappy if he receives a poor grade. If a particular child is anxious about such hostile motives because his idealized model does not permit such feelings, an inhibition of effort may occur. I recall my own seven-year old daughter saying to me after she had beaten me in a first game of checkers, "Now, Daddy, you win the second game so you won't feel too bad." The coercive pressure to work for the gentleman's C implies that to be overly zealous in academic work is to assume one of the essential characteristics inimical to the role of a gentleman -- that is, to be overly competitive. In this way, an intensely competitive attitude toward academic work may conflict with the person's values regarding aggression and the self label he would like to possess.

Finally, I would like to spend some time discussing the label that involves sex role identity. For it is clear that academic work is often associated with femininity or masculinity, and this association becomes established very early in development. The child's introduction to school is dominated by female teachers who initiate the activities of painting, coloring, and singing. These activities are clearly more appropriate for girls than for boys and some children view the school situation as more feminine than masculine. As a matter of fact, in a series of investigations last year on children in the first three grades we demonstrated quite clearly that second grade boys and girls regard the school situation as more feminine than masculine and that, with age, boys gradually come to regard the school situation as more masculine.

A more sophisticated differentiation of intellectual content occurred during the adolescent years. This differentiation turns on the schism between sciences and the humanities and the kinds of people who engage in certain intellectual activity. The child begins to classify knowledge as practical and impractical, as having an instrumental effect on the world, or as being unrelated to instrumental and important changes in the environment. Finally, he characterizes knowledge and the utilization of knowledge as either in the hands of men or women. Since a pragmatic and instrumental outlook are central values in the stereotype of the adult male, he is highly motivated to master practical knowledge but poorly motivated to acquire impractical material. This differential motivation results, in part, from the association between masculinity and the former and femininity and the latter. Moreover, men engage in work in the sciences, women in the arts and humanities. Thus, the physical sciences and mathematics are traditionally viewed as masculine, the arts and humanities as feminine with the social sciences forming an ambiguous middle ground. As a result of this association between type of subject matter and sex role labels, some men do very well in the sciences but cannot pass the languages or history -- subjects that require passive, rote, memorization of material that the student views as impractical and irrelevant for the perfection of those masculine skills that give him power and manipulation skills over the environment.

I would like now to pursue in greater detail the concept of sex role identification and sex role identity, because I believe, more than I did five years ago, that this is a most important construct that is intimately involved with many of the problems children and young adults experience.

The concept of sex role and its close relatives of sex typing and sex role identity have achieved much prominence during the last decade. It is surprising, however, that this concept has been so tardy in acquiring theoretical popularity.

among psychologists. For the behavioral differences between the sexes are quite public and have an ancient and transcultural heritage. Sociology and anthropology have not been as remiss in this area, for over a quarter of a century ago Linton wrote, "The division and ascription of status with relation to sex seems to be basic in all social systems. All societies describe different attitudes and activities to men and to women." We might inquire why the concept of sex role has been treated shabbily in psychological theory. I think one reason rests with the history of theory development in psychology. Behavioral and psychoanalytic theory have been the major comprehensive schemes for understanding behavior. Both systems placed needs at the center of mass of their systems and made strivings for the goals of food, production from pain, love, security, aggression, and sex the major determinants of behavior. These needs are common to both men and women and neither theory directed attention to sex differences in the hierarchy and patterning of these motives. Moreover, an emphasis on needs or motives and the attainment of external goals to satisfy them has camouflaged a fundamental human motive -- the desire to make one's behavior conform to a previously acquired standard. Devoted to match one's behavior to an internal standard or to an internal model -- such as a standard of masculinity -- differs in two fundamental ways from the traditional description of the motivational process in aggression, dependence, or sex. The strength of the former motive does not wax or wane to the degree that is characteristic of sexual or aggressive motivation. The arousal of sexual or aggressive motives is dependent, in large measure, on external provocations. The need or desire to make one's behavior conform to a standard of masculinity or femininity does not drift from negligible strength to intense values in different situations over short periods of time. Moreover, receipt of whatever reinforcement maintains the tendency to appear masculine does not weaken the motive underlying the response. The performance of the masculine act does

not weaken or destroy the desire to continue manifesting such behavior. For sex or aggression however, consummation typically attenuates the strength of the motive for a period of time.

It is obvious that children acquire standards or idealized models for a variety of dimensions -- cleanliness, obedience, honesty, mastery of academic subjects, coherence of speech. Many of these are of approximately equal salience for boys and girls. A sex role standard, however, dictates the adoption of different responses and attributes for boys and girls. The significance of the sex role standard rests with its governing influence upon the initiation of a broad spectrum of behaviors.

What is a sex role standard?

A sex role standard is a cognitive representation of the attributes, behaviors and attitudes that are associated with the concept male and female in a given culture. In effect, the sex standard summarizes the cultural appropriate characteristics for men and women. During the period 3-7 years of age the child gradually realizes that people fall into one or two categories -- boys or girls, men or women, fathers or mothers. The early discrimination of social objects into these two discrete classes is made possible by the variety of clearly discriminable cues including dress, bodily form and proportion, strength, distribution of hair, depth of voice, posture at the toilet, mode of interactive behavior with the child, characteristic behavior in the kitchen, the garage, or the backyard. It is not surprising that children come to regard men and women, boys and girls, as each possessing some degree of uniqueness.

Core attributes of masculinity and femininity.

The characteristics that define the concepts male and female can be regarded as primary or secondary depending on the communality of agreement among members of a culture. The primary sex role characteristics in the United States fall into one of three classes -- physical attributes, overt behaviors, and feelings,

attitudes, motives, and wishes.

Physical attributes.

Analysis of the public medias of the representation of males and females together with the results of the empirical studies of adolescent youngsters reveals that girls regard an attractive face, hairless body, and a small frame as desirable characteristics. Boys regard height, muscle mass, facial and bodily hair as desirable.

The culture's differential standards regarding the overt behavioral face to be exposed to the public are not as clearly delineated as the standards for the physical attributes but these rules are strongly felt, nonetheless. For females, a primary set of appropriate responses includes passivity and submissiveness, especially with males; inhibition of verbal and physical aggression; inhibition of overt signs of sexual desire; cultivation of domestic skills; ministration to one's children; and skill in social interaction. The corresponding list for males includes independence, interpersonal dominance with men and women, self defense in the face of attacks, sexual conquests, proficiency at mechanical tasks, and athletic prowess.

The primary cluster of covert attributes that are linked to the concept of the female includes the ability to gratify a love object and the ability to elicit sexual arousal in the male and the desire to be a wife and mother and the correlated desires to give nurturance to one's child and affection to one's love object, and the capacity for emotion. For males, the primary set of covert attributes includes a pragmatic attitude, ability to gratify a love object, absence of fear and a capacity to control expression of strong emotion in time of stress.

Sex role identity.

Thus far we have discussed sex role standards and defined them as the publicly shared belief regarding the appropriate characteristics for males and females.

But the abstract concept of an ideal male or female behaviorally is to be distinguished from a particular individual's conceptualization of his personal degree of masculinity or femininity - that is, his self label on this dimension. Such a label is determined in part by the degree to which the particular male feels; strong, dominant, sexually potent, skilled with gross motor tasks, and capable of inhibiting emotionally regressive behavior, or a particular woman feels; poised, suppressive of aggression, attractive to men, etc. The degree to which an individual regards himself as masculine or feminine we will call his sex role identity. This belief involves a continuum and is one component of that complex set of beliefs the individual holds about himself. The complete interlocking set is usually called a self concept or self identity. Thus, the self label on masculinity-femininity is but one slice of a larger pie. However, it is mandatory that an individual assign himself a value on the dimension of masculinity or femininity. Unlike some irrelevant attributes like the knowledge of the habits of birds or the ability to prune trees most individuals cannot declare an indifference to their sex role identity.

The degree of match or mismatch between the sex role standards of the subculture and individual's assessment of his own attributes provides him with a partial answer to the question "How masculine or how feminine am I"? Although a sex role identity is a cognitive belief it is not completely conscious and there is an imperfect correlation between possession of standard sex role attributes and the strength or integrity of one's identity. A man who practices many masculine behaviors may not necessarily regard himself as highly masculine. But it is probably impossible for a man to possess none of the sex typed attributes and regard himself as highly masculine.

The important principle that derives from this discussion is as follows: The child wishes to believe that his sex role behavior is consonant with a standard that represents the ideal boy or girl. He wants to crystallize an

adequate sex role identity. With age this standard become increasingly resistant to alteration and here I remind you once again of our critical period hypothesis. There will be a core of communality in this concept that applies to all members in the culture but there will be slight differences from child to child depending upon the particular family and subcultural milieu in which he was raised. Many behavioral choices are made in the interest of maintaining the child's belief that his behaviors, feelings and thoughts are congruent with those of the perfect male or female. Correlatively, behavioral choices are governed by the desire to avoid the elicitation of the thought "I am not behaving in a way congruent with my biological sex".

I am not going to dwell here on the mechanisms of acquisition because we have talked about these indirectly earlier in the paper. Briefly, you should remember that there are two sets of responses to be learned. That is, the covert self label of sex role identity and the specific attributes that define the sex roles. Identification with role models and exposure to certain parental patterns of reward and punishment are the essential catalysts for the acquisition of both sex role behaviors and a sex role identity.

I wish to make and point out an important sex difference in the conditions under which sex typed behavior and a sex role identity is learned. We have said that the primary overt behaviors that define masculinity include physical strength, retaliatory posture to attack, athletic prowess, mechanical skills, independence and suppression of regressive affect. For girls, primary characteristics include cultivation of attractiveness, and a concern with appearance, inhibition of aggression, social skills, and an affective approach to people and experience. The point of interest is this -- Most of the responses that girls must learn require reactions from other people. For a girl cannot assess whether she is attractive, socially poised, or passive with others without continued interaction and feedback from the social environment. The girl,

in effect, is required to be dependent upon people and their reactions for those experiences that establish sex typed behaviors. The boy, on the other hand, is fortunate enough to develop some sex typed behaviors while alone. Perfection of gross motor skills or mechanical tasks are often solitary endeavors. Witness for example the 10 year old boy shooting baskets in his back yard or fixing a bicycle. He receives from this solitary mastery important information that strengthens his conviction that he is acquiring masculine attributes. The major difference in the conditions under which sex typed traits are learned makes the average girl excessively dependent upon others and predisposes her to court the acceptance of peers and adults. Many experiments in child development during the last five years have consistently found an important sex difference in learning tasks. To put it most simply, when an examiner presents a heavy task, girls try to figure out the examiner, boys try to figure out the task. That is, girls are much more oriented to behaving in a way that will get reward and praise from the examiner and avoid his rejection. Boys, on the other hand, are more likely to try to master the task, and are, therefore, more independent of these specific actions of the examiner. The girl sees her task as getting the adult to respond in a certain way; a boy sees his task as a solution of the problem qua problem.

The perception and classification of sex typed traits by children and adults.

Let us briefly review some of the most relevant empirical research on sex role identity that can support some of these contentions.

There is an amazing degree of communality among children and adults regarding some of the major sex role behaviors. For example, it is difficult to find a sound study on preschool or school age children in which aggressive behavior was not more frequent among boys than among girls. This sex difference in aggressive behavior is matched by the perception of adults by children. If children are asked which parent is more dangerous or more punitive (i.e., aggressive) both boys and girls agree that the father is more aggressive than the mother. This difference also holds when stimuli symbolic of aggression are used (e.g., a tiger versus a rabbit, an alligator versus a bird). It is, therefore, not surprising that parents have differential standards for aggression for their children; they expect more overt aggression from boys than they do from girls.

For affiliative, dependent, and nurturant behaviors there is a greater license for girls than for boys and a majority of investigations of overt behavior or story telling responses reveal more frequent occurrence of affiliative, nurturant and dependent behavior for girls, and greater preoccupation with people and harmonious interpersonal relations among girls than among boys.

Correspondingly, women are seen by children as more nurturant than men and women see themselves as more nurturant than their male counterparts. The circle is therefore complete with both children and adults expecting and receiving more dependence and nurturance from females, more aggression from males.

Sex role identification and intellectual mastery

Although competence in intellectual and academic tasks is not as clearly a sex typed trait as aggression or dependency, there is sufficient evidence available to suggest that degree of involvement in most academic problems is

greater for boys than for girls. This difference appears to be a partial product of the fact that problems requiring analysis and reasoning (primarily those involving spatial reasoning and mathematics) are viewed as more appropriate for boys than for girls and girls perform less well on them. To illustrate, Milton (1958) reported that when adolescent or adult subjects are presented with problems involving primarily arithmetic or geometric reasoning, the males consistently obtained higher scores than females. Moreover, there is a low positive relation between masculinity scores on the Terman-Miles Masculinity-Femininity Test and problem solving scores for both sexes. The female who rejects traditional feminine interests performs better on these tests than the girl who has strongly adopted a traditional feminine set of behaviors. However, if the verbal problem deals with feminine content, (cooking or gardening materials) the female score much better than if the problem dealt with guns, money, or geometric designs, even though the logical steps and computations were identical. It would appear that when the typical female is confronted with standard problems involving geometry, physics, logic, or arithmetic she behaves as though the ability to solve these tasks were uniquely masculine and her motivation to attack such problems is low. This decreased involvement suggests either that the girl's self esteem is not at stake in such problems, or that some girls are potentially threatened by the possibility that they might perform with competence on such tasks. For unusual excellence on such tasks may be equated with a loss of femininity.

The sex difference in attitudes to problem solving appears early in development and under different guises. Boys are more likely to adopt an analytic attitude to natural events in the environment and to formal problems. Smith (1933) for example, reported that preschool boys asked many more "how" and "why" questions spontaneously, whereas girls preferentially asked questions about social rules and the conventional labels to be applied to objects.

Milton (1958) gave problems to men and women and asked them to state whether their preference would be to analyze the situation, go for help, or adopt a trial-and-error approach in the solution of this problem. Males were much more likely to select the analytic alternative.

McDavid (1959) had children three to nine years of age observe an adult perform a task. When the children were later asked to perform the task the girls were more likely to imitate the adult than the boys. Crandall and Rabson (1960) gave children two puzzles, one of which they solved, the other they failed. Then the children were asked subsequently to which one they wished to return, more boys than girls chose the failed puzzle. In sum, as early as age five, boys appear to be more analytic and more counterphobic in intellectual problem situations. This difference grows with time and by late adolescence and adulthood the typical female has developed extreme feelings of inadequacy when faced with problems requiring analysis and reasoning - especially when such problems are phrased in the context of the sciences, geometry or mathematics.

The sex typed character of domains of knowledge is most evident in the vocational choices of young adolescents. A recent national survey of thousands of high school students conducted by Project Talent asked students about their planned major in college and future occupational choice. The sex typed character of their choices was already evident in the ninth grade. For example, 25% of the boys and only 3% of the girls selected the physical or natural sciences or engineering; whereas 3% of the boys and 13% of the girls chose elementary or secondary school education as future vocations. In general, academic majors and occupational roles dealing primarily with people or language (e.g., education, writing, psychology) were preferred by girls; vocational roles requiring interaction with objects or nature were chosen by boys.

Physical Maturation and sex typing.

Since physical attributes (i.e., attractive face and figure for girls,

bodily hair, height, and size for boys) are essential sex typed traits one might expect children who have early growth spurts at puberty and develop secondary sex characteristics early will be more popular, more confident, and initiate heterosexual behavior earlier and with more frequency than children who mature late. Investigations by Jones and Mussen using the longitudinal data from the University of California Institute of Human Development verify this expectation (Jones, 1957; Jones and Mussen, 1958; Mussen and Jones, 1957; Mussen and Jones, 1958; Stone and Barker, 1939). The boy who matures late and has little facial and bodily hair, small genitals and small physique realizes his deviation from community norms and begins to doubt his ability to interact successfully with females. He is apt to withdraw from social interaction, engage in more attention getting behaviors and less likely to become a leader.

Early and late maturing boys and girls also differ in their interests. In a study of pre- and post menarchial girls (Stone and Barker, 1939) it was found that the post menarchial girls were more interested in social activities with the opposite sex and in personal adornment. The girls who had reached menarche were also less interested in games requiring vigorous gross motor activity.

As one might expect early maturing boys obtain more masculine interest scores than late maturing boys while early maturing girls obtain more feminine interest scores than their late maturing counterparts.

Social class differences in sex role behavior.

It appears that there are distinct social class differences in the degree to which children adopt traditional sex typed traits, and lower class children typically are more consistent in this regard and adopt these traits earlier (Rabban, 1950). This finding is consonant with the fact that lower class parents were more concerned with traditional sex typing than middle class parents. Pope (1953) has found that both lower and middle class boys reject

the effeminate boy with nonmasculine interests but differ in their attitude toward the academically studious boy. Middle class boys accept him while lower class boys reject him. Among girls, both classes accept the studious girl. However, the middle class girl rejects the aggressive and sexually forward girl, whereas the lower class female is more likely to accept her.

So ends our sortie into the existing data. Let us turn now to a consideration of the significance of sex role identity.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHILD'S SEX ROLE IDENTITY

The child's continuing desire for a stable and firm sex role identification plays a central role in directing his development for it sets strong constraints upon future behavioral choices. In this final section we will discuss the relationship of sex role identification to three psychological problems:

(a) stability of behavior over time, (b) differential mastery of intellectual skills in academic settings, and (c) sexuality and behavior with love objects.

Relationship of sex role identification to continuities in behavior

The degree of continuity of selected response classes is a topic of both practical and theoretical significance. Knowledge of the age at which we can obtain a preview of future behavior is important for practitioners who wish to initiate prophylactic or immediate treatment procedures, whether the area be delinquency, obsessive-compulsive rituals, or academic difficulties. From a theoretical vantage point, such knowledge furnishes clues to the specific developmental eras during which investigations into the conditions of learning may be most profitable.

A recent study of the long term stability of behavior from birth to adulthood in a group of subjects from the Fels Research Institute's longitudinal population suggested some important conclusions regarding the relationship of sex role identification to behavioral continuities (Kagan and Moss, 1962). Briefly, the procedure involved study of the relations between two independent

and adult passive-dependency. But childhood passivity and dependency predicted lack of competitiveness, lack of aggression, and avoidance of sexuality in adulthood - behaviors that have a passive flavor to them.

Childhood aggression predicted aggression in adult men but was unrelated to phenotypically diverse responses. For women, childhood aggression predicted competitiveness, intellectual mastery, and rejection of feminine sex typing, but not anger arousal or aggression. These data suggested the following tentative generalization. When a childhood behavior is congruent with sex role standards it is likely to be predictive of phenotypically similar behavior in adolescence and adulthood. When it conflicts with sex role standards, it is likely to be unrelated to behavior manifestly similar to the childhood response but predictive of theoretically derived behaviors that are socially more acceptable. It appears, therefore, that the sex role appropriateness of a response is a major determinant of its developmental stability and the degree to which theoretically related behaviors will appear in the behavioral repertoire of the individual.

It is of importance to note that the tendency to practice sex typed behaviors was highly stable from early childhood to adulthood. The correlations between practice of sex appropriate activities during age six to ten and adulthood was .63 for men and .44 for women. This finding is supported by data from the Oakland Growth Study (Mussen, 1961, 1962) which revealed a moderately high relationship between degree of masculine interests in males from adolescence through adulthood.

Sex role identification and academic mastery

In the previous sections we suggested that an individual's anxiety over his sex role identity (i.e., the degree to which his self image deviated from cultural standards for traditional masculine and feminine activities) exerted a strong effort on the initiation of new responses and the maintenance of

old ones. Moreover, we also presented reasons why mastery of academic tasks might become associated with standards for sex typed activities early in development and why there is a close semantic relation between masculinity or femininity and specific areas of knowledge for most members of western culture. This is an unfortunate marriage for one would hope that knowledge would retain neutrality amidst the warring factions of the mind. However, there is cause for some optimism. Unlike many undesirable psychological states that plague man, this tie between area of knowledge and sex role appropriateness can be changed through less than drastic modifications in procedures in the elementary and secondary schools of our country. Teachers have to begin to believe that girls can do as well as boys in mathematics and science and not always expect boys to perform with greater competence. Female teachers must become themselves more confident about their ability in the sciences and become adequate models for young girls. Similarly, English and the languages should be taught by more men and the expectation that girls are naturally superior in verbal and language skills should be forgotten. The ties that bind pragmatism, science, mathematics, to masculinity must be cut and the schools can serve this cause in a major way.

Sex role identification and sexuality

Since success in heterosexual relations is a critical component of a satisfactory sex role identity in adults, it is not surprising that disturbances in sex role identification are associated with disturbances in sexual behavior. Sex role standards for males call for sexual initiative with girls, a confidence in one's ability to satisfy the girl, and easy dominance in the boy-girl dyad. Attractiveness to girls is also required and demands certain attributes of strength, size, and distribution of bodily hair. The sex role standards for girls call for inhibition of sexual excitement, passivity in the boy-girl relationship, and ability to satisfy the partner. The girl also wants to be attractive, have a small frame, and moderate sized breasts.

Deviations from these standards lead to different degrees of anxiety and apprehension in relationships with the opposite sex. Thus, the sixteen year old boy who is small, not shaving, and shy will be afraid to initiate heterosexual relationships for fear that the girl will reject him or find him undesirable. He will fear initiation of erotic activity because he doubts his ability to maintain an erection. He may fear that his genitals will be too small and that he will be an inadequate sex partner. Similarly, the girl who feels unattractive because of facial or bodily attributes anticipates that she will not attract boys and she avoids situations in which such rejection might be realized. There is, of course, no perfect relationship between an adolescent's perception of his degree of physical attractiveness and his physical attributes as judged by others. But neither is this relationship negligible. In general, most adolescents have a fairly realistic appraisal of their physical attractiveness to others gained, of course, through social experience and exposure to the values of the mass media.

We have discussed the fact that late maturing boys whose physiques differ from the cultural ideal are late in establishing heterosexual behavior (Mussen and Jones, 1957, 1958). The Fels longitudinal data suggest that adolescent boys with nonmasculine interests during early childhood were anxious about sexuality and less likely to have erotic experiences with girls than young boys with more conventional masculine interests.

In sum, the adolescent's expectancy of success in heterosexual contacts is related to the degree to which he or she practices sex typed activities and possesses sex typed attributes. There is a circular dynamic involved in the relation between sex role identification and sexual behavior, especially for boys. Since sexual experience with girls is a vital ingredient in attaining a satisfactory sex role identity, most boys strive hard to obtain these goals, in the same way that the boy practices foul shots in his driveway. For every

successful sexual conquest helps to close the gap between the existing assessment of the self and the idealized sex role model. Thus, much sexual activity among males is motivated by the desire to strengthen a masculine identification rather than by overwhelming biological urges.

The occurrence of homosexual behavior or fear of being a homosexual is often related to anxiety over not attaining the masculine ideal. To most adolescents and adults in our society, the term homosexual implies the following behavioral triad - not interested in girls, slight of build, feminine interests. The adolescent or adult male who possesses these attributes is in danger of beginning to believe that he may be a homosexual. The irrational character of this conclusion is no safeguard against its appearance. The boy who has failed to develop masculine interests (for any one of a variety of reasons) will be anxious about initiating heterosexual behavior because of the anticipation of being rejected. This chronic anxiety soon leads to an avoidance of girls and a growing apathy until the individual comes to believe that he is incapable of becoming interested in girls. He does not interpret his apathy and avoidance as the sequelae of long standing fear. Instead, he interprets it as an indication that he is a homosexual. The panic that results from this realization leads to a more intense fear of initiating contact with women. For the self label homosexual carries with it the guarantee of failure in a heterosexual relation.

A recent book on homosexuality by a group of psychoanalysts (Bieber et al. 1962) reports that a high percentage of homosexual men avoided traditional masculine interests and activities as children and adolescents. For example, homosexual men, in contrast to a control group were, as children, less likely to play baseball, to participate in competitive group games, or to become involved in fights with other boys. Chang and Block (1960) compared 20 male homosexuals and 20 controls. Each subject described his ideal self, his father,

his mother, and himself. The controls and homosexuals did not differ in the characteristics of their ego ideal. For example, both homosexual and control men rejected dependency as a desired trait for the ideal self. However, the homosexual male saw himself as more dependent and less ambitious than the control men - traits that are alien to the traditional masculine ideal. It is not suggested that pathognomonic parent-child relations are not relevant for the development of this complex class of behavior. But it is suggested that a perception of marked deviance from the masculine ideal is one antecedent of the feeling that one has homosexual wishes and, therefore, the probability of engaging in homosexual behavior. Fear of interaction with females as a result of a fragile masculine sex role identity is often present in the attitude structure of the group our culture calls homosexual.

To summarize, the construct of sex role identification is not without its ambiguity and one could argue for its fragmentation into several better articulated terms. Its retention as a descriptive and explanatory concept rests on the assumption that the concepts male and female and the dimensions maleness and femaleness are basic to our language. The evidence supports this assumption. The child as young as four has dichotomized the world into male and female people and is concerned with boy-girl differences. By the time he is seven he is intensely committed to molding his behavior in concordance with cultural standards appropriate to his biological sex and he shows uneasiness, anxiety and even anger when he is in danger of behaving in ways regarded as characteristic of the opposite sex. The cry "sissy" or "tomboy" has a strong affective charge. There is no doubt that most boys and girls adopt the behaviors appropriate to their sex. We have argued, in addition, that the desire to behave in accordance with sex role standards extends far beyond an interest in sports for boys and cooking for girls. For the desire to establish a sex role iden-

tification touches many important sets of behaviors, including school work, sexual behavior, vocational choice, and has a strong effect on behavioral continuities and discontinuities over the course of development.

The emphasis on a motive to match one's behavior to a standard has been central in our discussion. It is suggested that one of the most compelling human motives is the desire to reduce the discrepancy between an internal standard and the ever changing behavior of the individual. Thus we suggest that initiation of sexual behavior, verbal aggression, destruction, or mastery of academic skills are sometimes intermediate goals that serve a much more powerful master - the desire for congruence between an ideal representation of the self and one's every day behavior. This appears to be a uniquely human motive and psychology is witness to a refreshing confluence of theoretical writings which emphasize this theoretical point of view. Festinger (1957) suggests that cognitive dissonance is an annoying state of affairs that elicits behavior aimed at reducing the dissonance. Heider (1958) argues for the human need for cognitive harmony and balance. One of the central axes around which such harmonies are played is the standard for sex role behavior. It is obvious that unnecessary conflicts are generated because of anxiety over sex role standards. Fortunately, there are many positive actions that educators, mass communication experts, and parents can initiate in an attempt to attenuate these conflicts. The school situation is much too concerned with boy-girl differences. The elementary school must introduce more men into the lower grades, de-emphasize the value of attractiveness and social poise for girls; the value of mastery of practical subjects, and strength for boys.

The mass media also have a responsibility in this domain. The stereotyped picture of boys as strong; girls as weak; boys as good with numbers; girls as incompetent; boys as brave; girls as afraid; has an insidious effect on the malleable self images of children. Once learned, these values are not easily

altered. But they are modifiable during the early school years and modified they must be.

The training of the guidance student

In the final moments of this much too lengthy address permit me a few words concerning the future training of the guidance student- assuming the best of all possible university situations. It should be obvious from the emphasis I have placed on basic theory in personality development that I regard such knowledge as fundamental for the repertoire of this new professional.

If we take the notion of the critical period seriously and accept the empirically based suggestion that much of the foundation of adult character is formed by early adolescence, then it is an inescapable conclusion that the first 6 years of school are the most opportune time to detect the early signs of academic apathy, reading problems, excessive anxiety and timidity, sexual anomalies, and festering delinquency, and, having detected them, to intervene with maximal effectiveness. This complimentary pair of tasks - detection and skilled intervention - requires consummate skill on the part of a wise professional, not a technician. The tasks demand a professional with a feeling of adequacy, one who feels he knows most of what is known in the area, one who does not regard himself as a subsidiary member of a satellite group who defers to a psychiatrist or a psychologist the more difficult and challenging job of interpreter and therapy. It is a bald fact that we do not have now, and will not have in the foreseeable future anywhere near the sufficient number of competent child therapists necessary to handle the problems that are extant in every classroom. We cannot afford, therefore, the luxury of a diagnostician who tell teachers or parents that a particular child is not doing well in school and suggest that they see a child psychiatrist or visit a guidance clinic. This position is unrealistic in terms of the availability of skilled psychiatrists and, moreover, such an orientation attenuates the feeling of responsibility to

the case and to the child, that the guidance person should feel. I urge that future training programs in guidance be rigorous, and comprehensive - not a cheap degree for the less able student who chose guidance because he didn't feel capable of matriculating in a stiff Ph.D. program. This program should be a stiff Ph.D. program containing comprehensive treatment of personality theory, developmental psychology, sociology, anthropology, physiological psychology, and basic neurology, and a sophisticated course in psychological testing. I would hope that the graduate of such a program would have a sound background in all we know about the first 15 years of life and our assessment methods - crude as they are. I would be disappointed if the professional guidance worker became another test person - one who administers the California Test of Mental Maturity, the Lorge Thorndike or the MMPI and then drew up the traditional test profile. We are passing through the end of an era in psychological testing - a period characterized by a rather rigid interpretation of test scores and an imperfect appreciation of the meaning and variability of various test scores. Let us take as an example the concept of the IQ. We are coming to realize that this score is no more than a practical tool for placement with little theoretical meaning. The score is capable of predicting school progress with moderate accuracy - and make no mistake - I regard this as a valuable resource. But it is not a sacred and fixed human attribute given by ones heredity and constant from age 4 to 94. It is a 45 minute representative sampling of what the child knows and his motivation to master new subject matter primarily in the area of verbal and language skills. Since there are different domains of knowledge and since we do not expect children to be equally competent or equally motivated in all areas of knowledge it is necessary that we assess different skills, knowledge, and motivation in a variety of areas. For example, we need and are devising tests of classification strategies; of preferences and skills for divergent or convergent reasoning; of interest and

competence in the sciences or mathematics or languages. Work by Witkin on field independence and our own investigations on analytic categorizations point to the importance of pervasive individual differences among children in the degree of analysis and differentiation the child utilizes in classifying his environment - and the degree to which he reflects before offering an answer or fixing a label in contrast to an impulsive and more frequently inaccurate answer, hypothesis, or classification. These conceptual habits, which are intimately involved in problem solving, are independent of traditional IQ score and are not measured in any systematic way in existing group or individual tests.

Further, we are beginning to realize that the sex role appropriateness of a problem - something I like to call the dress of the problem - influences the degree of involvement or apathy displayed by the student. If the principle to be learned is; the area of a circle is πr^2 , you are apt to get more girls motivated if the problem talks about the area of pie or cake pans, and apt to get more boys motivated if the problem deals with Mars, the moon, or missiles.

These are some new developments in psychology and we must realize that the field is in a state of great flux. Tests that have been used during the last generation will not be with us a decade hence. Thus, the strongest intellectual armor we can give the new student is a sound theoretical understanding of mental activity, and the complexities of human personality. - as the medical school faculty spends 2 years presenting to the medical student basic facts and theories in the biological sciences. Only then will the future guidance professional feel secure enough to evaluate the newly marketed tests and to select with wisdom the instruments that show the greatest promise for his problem.

I have rambled and feel obligated to pull some loose strings together. I have drawn my personal - though not original - scheme of personality and have

placed special emphasis upon critical periods in development. Although there are many response processes beginning their most rapid period of growth during the first 15 years, we have singled out the process of identification and model selection for special treatment. Stripped of its complex theoretical syntax, the suggestion is that the child wants to be an adult because it seems to him that adults have it better. The child of 5 to 10 is most receptive to molding or matching his behavior after that of an adult model, because he believes - irrational as it may seem - that such matching will increase the probability of his attaining the prized goals of the adult model. Therapists, educator and parent must come to appreciate that each of them is - in addition to anything else - a model - as well as the one who teaches multiplication tables, permits aggression in a play room, or punishes dishonesty. Since the child is most malleable during the preadolescent years, adults in commerce with him must be individuals whom the child will be likely to adopt as models. - someone the child will like and admire simultaneously. Educators deplore the fact that the average 6 year old enters school eager and hungry for knowledge and at 13 is sullen, apathetic, and hostile to the school situation. Why? I submit that it is not because of soiled or old books, or dilapidated schools, but because of inadequate teacher models - models who do not communicate the simple fact that they like the child and that they are interested and excited about the attainment of new knowledge. Take the simple problem of the 6 to 1 ratio of boys to girls who suffer reading problems in the first 3 or 4 grades. I have suggested on previous occasions that this unusual sex difference is due, in part, to the fact that females are teaching reading in Grades 1, 2, and 3 at a time when the boys are in the height of their identification with their fathers. As a result of this identification they are rebelling from seeking female approval and are alienated by the fact that women, and not men, value reading. I was heartened last month to learn that in Quebec and some parts of

Canada, men traditionally teach reading in the primary grades and that there is no excessive ratio of boy to girl reading problems. I recently persuaded a Superintendent in an Ohio school to do an experiment in his institution - that is, to place a man in one first grade against 3 control classes and to study the relative rate of progress during this year. We will know the results in June.

Research on the influence of a model is urgently needed. The classes of research problems that a guidance staff might initiate could include - what is the effect of the sex of a model, be it teacher or guidance person, the degree to which the model has power in the child's eyes, the degree to which the child sees the model as nurturant or rejecting, as similar to himself or as dissimilar to himself. How do variations in these variables effect learning, rate of progress in a therapeutic situation, motivation, loss of symptoms.

The child seeks heroes and if we provide him with the models he needs we may solve marvelously those developmental anomalies that must be eliminated if we are to have a social organization more harmonious than the one we live with today.

DISCUSSION

Comment: I feel that the term "tomboy" is almost socially acceptable, in fact Perry Como has a very nice song on the radio. The term "sissy" is much worse.

J. Kagan: As you may know, there has been a lot of empirical work in this area and the results are this. Up to age 18 girls have much more license in masculine areas than boys have in feminine areas but in adolescence the pressure is really raised.

Question: A quick question. In data gathering I've done on patterns of self-disclosure in the Southeast, where I collected most of my data, the men turn out consistently to be lower in disclosure of themselves to significant people. One of Allport's students did a study in Harvard males and Radcliffe females and didn't find the sex difference.

J. Kagan: That's Radcliffe females.

Comment: No, I suggest that men are men and women are women in the South. That may be less true elsewhere.

J. Kagan: I think there are very important regional differences.

Comment: There seems to be a difference in the influence of models in the early years; that is, the influence is greater. Yet, you might have significant changes in behavior at any time.

J. Kagan: Look, this is a continuum. We have to consider how the degrees of freedom get lost with age. Yet, we wouldn't be here, adults wouldn't enter therapy, competent and responsible psychiatrists wouldn't accept patients over 30, if they felt there was no chance for change. There always is chance for change. The question is: what is the likelihood and receptivity for change?

Comment: I was very interested in the possibility of the dynamics of the differences between what the person actually is and what he thinks he is and the ideal model. You stressed the activity of the individual in gauging his response to those which are close to the model or avoiding those which are far from it. I wonder if you would consider some of the other things people can do to reduce distance besides changing their behavior -- for instance, devaluing the ideal model. I saw a homosexual in therapy who said he was a homosexual because his father who wanted him to be masculine very badly was a drunk who beat up his mother. Although the culture was pushing him towards the father, as a model, this was someone who was nasty and a drunk. Other things were devaluing these qualities. Some people have ideal models but don't feel they have to get there. It takes a cognitive element to say that one is living up to the ideal model. Again you have psychosis where the person says "I am that". I just want to raise the point that all of these are alternatives. I think there might be some research here.

J. Kagan: That's a very relevant point. My theoretical reply would be I think the degree to which you can devalue the cognition depends on the degree of salience for you. By some standards the appropriate way to reduce dissonance is to devalue the cognition. But I am suggesting that there are some

other dimensions. If you are bombarded with the values of the culture you are in day after day it is very difficult. Take masculinity, if you have dissonance it is very hard to get out of this situation by devaluing it, to say it is not important that I be strong or sexually attractive or able to have relationships with girls. It is terribly hard to rationalize that.

E. Lloyd-Jones: May I put in something here. Jerry, I want to follow this up with you. Then we can get together and talk about it further. I'm concerned about the difficulties that men have in establishing their masculinity but I'm even more, I think, at the moment concerned about the difficulties that girls and women have in finding a feminine model that for them is not restrictive in terms of the development of their capabilities. I'm working now on a committee of the present condition and status of women (the President's Commission on the Status of Women). One of the men there brought up to date some figures that I pulled together some years ago. Back in the 1900's about 19% of all the people taking doctor's degrees in this country were women. By 1930 about 16% were women. In 1928 and 30 the average number of women coming out of law school each year was about 400. In 1958-60 the number was 288.

J. Kagan: That's very interesting.

E. Lloyd-Jones: You talk about femininity as though we knew what it was. If a girl just conformed to this, then this is the way to salvation. She could become a happy, fulfilled woman. For example, you talk about the ideal role of women as representing a large component of passivity.

J. Kagan: The culture says it.

E. Lloyd-Jones: I am very interested in following what I think this is actually doing to the development of the capacities of girl people.

J. Kagan: It's crippling.

E. Lloyd-Jones: It's very crippling. I think at the moment in our mystique there is an idea that for men to fully develop themselves they need the counterfoil of dependent, passive people who will help them to realize themselves. I think that there is a great imperfection in this, which in the guidance movement we have, somehow, got to get over. As I work with our men students, in training, I find I struggle, very ineffectively, I'm afraid, with this whole problem with them. They are so concerned in our culture that men should be men that they are a little bit less concerned that women should fully realize all of their potentialities in their way.

J. Kagan: Take this experiment where we had to persuade a male to take the job as first grade teacher. We didn't want to say it was an experiment because we wouldn't have the perfect control. He wouldn't take the job. Then we said this was part of an experiment. That was masculine. Then he took it. Because it was for research.

E. Lloyd-Jones: Who is going to look out really for the interests and the full development of girls? I think your paper is brilliant, but all the way through it's boy and man centered. I can analyze this for you and show you.

E. Westervelt: I must say this. I did read the full paper from which some of this was taken and I think Jerry was forced, by time pressures, to skip

the part which shows it is really not boy and man centered. I also want to say this, with reference to the important question that Esther raised about femininity. You spoke about the girl with fragile sexual identity therefore being uncomfortable in the graduate school situation. In the Lesser research on achievement motivation in girls the most interesting incidental finding was that there was a negative relation between intellectual achievement and concern with woman's role but, conversely, no correlation between a girl's feeling comfortable in her feminine role and intellectual achievement. To state it simply, it does seem that the woman who becomes comfortable with herself as a woman is then free to achieve.

J. Kagan: The point is that too few females ever get to this point. The lousy thing is that our culture is so diabolic in its implanting of these ridiculous and irrational values. But they take. We are brainwashed.

FURTHER QUESTIONS FROM THE SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

If there is merit in the notion of critical periods, this would be a powerful reason for having counselors in the elementary school. If there are points beyond which intervention is no longer likely to be effective what role do you envisage for the secondary school or college counselor? How much weight do you attach to the concept of irreversibility?

What are the psychodynamics involved in the process of identifying a model? In what way do the needs of the individual determine the selection of a model? Dissonance between the ideal self and conceived self can be a powerful motive, but it is not a motive when the dissonance is too great.

Doesn't the intentional provision of adult models violate "freedom to become?"

Could Kagan's pattern of research on idealized models in children be translated into one for research on the idealized model in the guidance counselor?

How can children cope with powerful models who reduce their freedom?

KAGAN AND MAY DISCUSSION

R. May: We used to have on the Yankee baseball team a very good catcher by the name of Yogi Berra -- an excellent catcher but not very quick in the upper story. Yogi always used to hit at the first ball the pitcher threw and Stengel once shouted at him, with great violence: "When you get to the plate, think, Yogi, think!" And Yogi said: "How can I think and bat too?" I think often our problem in communicating with each other is thinking. I think it's a misuse of "thinking" but nevertheless it's what happens, particularly in our scientific groups. Thinking gets in the way of opening, of experiencing. I let myself go this morning. Often this does get a negative reaction - very surprising thing. My job as first speaker this morning was to pry you loose and to open things up as best I could, not to give answers.

Question: Is your language and Kierkegaard's akin to poetry?

R. May: Kierkegaard always said that he wanted to be a poet and not a philosopher. He had tremendous ability. Every third page, when he gets logical, the man is tremendous but he wanted to be taken as a poet. I can't put myself on that level. What I wanted to do this morning was to communicate ideas as I experienced them, an approach which has some intellectuality. I could defend my point logically, but I didn't try to do it that way. I planned to simply share with friends.

Comment: I have the impression that a good many of the men here have something which could be vaguely called a social scientist orientation. It was to some of us (I think possibly I can speak only for myself) difficult to conceive of a dialogue related to freedom and responsibility which must not at all points be wholly related to all relationships, especially the social relationships. It was the lack of this sort of emphasis or of the utilization of this aspect of the whole thing which struck me as somehow a limitation in your remarks this morning.

R. May: It isn't that I don't believe that social structure is inseparable from freedom and responsibility. I think one implies the other. There's no freedom except with structure. I come from the interpersonal school which, as one of you gentlemen was saying this morning, comes from George Herbert Meade through Sullivan, and in the theory of the interpersonal school the social emphasis is sometimes stressed to the point of the loss of individuality. Sullivan used to say that the individual was a fiction, yet there was no greater individual since Adam than Harry Stack Sullivan. But Harry Stack Sullivan's point of view can be used for a kind of a diffusion of conformism. If your interpersonal relationships are healthy, you are. That, of course, makes it much too simple.

When Esther Lloyd-Jones called me up eight or nine months ago to be part of this project, I said I don't think I'm your man because I'm a long way away from guidance, and I don't know that I really will have much to say. She said we want somebody to give a discussion on the presuppositions, which always have a philosophical as well as a psychological dimension, that underlie the helping relationship. This is what I hoped to do this morning. I have confidence that you who know more about guidance than I do will be able to

arrive at your own orientation to these more concrete and institutional problems.

I don't know much about research in the sense you are using it. I know something about psychotherapeutic research; our way of validating of course can't be translated -- namely I can tell whether I am right with a patient by what happens over the next days and weeks and months, particularly what happens over a period of years. For example, this patient I mentioned this morning -- my way of validating -- is to see what results in her dreams and so on. So that on the research questions that you ask me I say again, without any apology, as each of us can't cover everything in his life, take them to someone who knows more about research than I do.

I do not believe that the counselor should turn away from the behavioral sciences to the philosopher and theologian; I do think the counselor should know more about philosophy and theology than he now knows. I think that to be able to understand and clarify your own philosophical presuppositions is the essence of sound work with other human beings. I think it is also the essence of sound psychology, of sound science of any sort. I think one of our great shortcomings in psychology, one of Freud's shortcomings, was that he and we never really analyzed our presuppositions about the nature of man. What I was trying to do this morning was to broaden behavioral science. It still is your major source of information and knowledge but I think it must be broadened.

In the gap between stimulus and response there is a lot more going on beside symbolization. There is anxiety, a consideration of alternative ways of reaction and so on. In guidance, you've got to work with a structure of rules in your school. It's utterly unthinkable that somebody be turned loose to do as he pleases. Freedom has nothing whatever to do with doing as you please. Structure and influencing goes on all the time. But the important thing is that it not go on as say under hypnosis, with unawareness on the part of one person, namely the student, or that you pretend you aren't controlling when you are. If you have to insist that he take such and such classes, insist it. Say that this is a requirement of the school. I have nothing against such requirements, the only thing is they need to be on a level of awareness so the other person has the freedom to choose how he will react to the requirement. He, at least, then has the choice; you may say to him, "You're not going to like this but to get a diploma this is what's required." There is no reason why you should apologize for this.

J. Kagan: The three kinds of questions I saw had to do with three issues. Issue one was, "What are the implications of my thoughts and hypotheses about modeling for what counselors could do for the whole educational process and development in general?" And under that a corollary, "How do all these conditions that I stated as necessary in that situation -- how do they interact?" A second kind of question had to do with the notion of critical periods and its relevance.

The third question which I extracted as implicit in many questions which you asked took the following form, "What are the implications of the critical periods in the choice of model for the kind of child we want to have?" It was always stated that way. This bothers me because it seems to me there was an assumption that there was only one kind of child to have. I was surprised that in a group this sophisticated there would be any delimitation

of the kind of child, as if we all had a very good idea of what the perfect human being is. The question should be, "What kinds of models should the child have so that he will develop optimally?" I say to that quite explicitly, and I don't think this is an evasive answer at all, you tell me what kind of child you want, what kind of adolescent you want, and then we can talk about the kind of models. If you want to create a poet, the model milieu of that child will be much different from the milieu that will create a General Patton. And we need and will have various kinds of roles to fill.

Comment: We can provide a model but we never know what the reaction to the model would be. I would add something else: I don't think we have the right to manipulate people in that way.

J. Kagan: Whether we have a right or no, we are influencing that child. We may say, "I have no right to do it," but once you interact with that human being, you might as well accept the responsibility that you are influencing his motivational structure and his future character. You can say, "I don't want to do that," and withdraw. But you have no choice if you're a teacher, counselor, therapist, as far as I'm concerned. I will say it boldly, you might as well accept the responsibility that you have to make a decision about influencing that person's life. I think every therapist does this.

R. May: Do you mean that the therapist should himself assume a certain model form which would then have this influence?

J. Kagan: Not in an acting way, Rollo, but you are a model.

R. May: Let's just get this clear. If you want to have such and such influence on a child, admitting you are a model, then you should be the kind of model that would have an influence ...

J. Kagan: You mean if you wanted to get a certain effect out of a child. Let's get concrete: this child is not doing well in school, and you feel that it is a good thing for him to get good grades in the fifth grade.

R. May: That's the point; doesn't this reflect a dreadful arrogance toward another human? We sort of say, "By God, he's got to get good grades." How dare we feel this way? This is a human person here. Am I going to say because I'm a father, my kids must get good grades?

J. Kagan: It may be dreadful, but, you realize, as parents you do this every day.

R. May: This is one of the places where guidance differs dramatically from therapy. The school counselor is in a public school under the Board of Education. He's put there for reasons; one is to help the child to learn. You accept that responsibility, you help him -- that's one of the models, there are others.

J. Kagan: I have never met a parent -- if there's one in the audience, I'd like to have him stand up -- who has not had values about behavioral outcomes, who has not said, "I'd like the child to be this way," and who has not behaved in a way to try to influence that process; not perhaps directly through rewards or punishment.

N. Hobbs: This is getting emotional and quite personal.

R. May: Let's all accept emotion; it's here to stay.

Comment: Let me be personal, then. I have a girl, Jerry, who for a year because of her own particular adolescent struggles, was doing very poorly in school. Her teachers were saying she was an underachiever. I think at a conscious level, at least, my wife and I did the best we could to say, "We respect you as a human being and we'll try to be with you in this struggle you're going through. Maybe eventually it will mean you'll be satisfied with low grades, and maybe it won't; we don't know." But I think I'm speaking honestly when I say, no, we did not feel that somehow subtly we had to try to exercise some influence so that she would get better grades.

J. Kagan: I'm being misunderstood, so I want to say this. I am not saying at all that the guidance person or therapist (or parent, for that matter, because they share many functions) always plays for the culturally-approved behavior. Absolutely not. But I do believe this, that the parent-educator-counselor makes a decision in Rollo's sense. Sometimes the decision is no, striving for good grades is not a right thing. I don't think he does not make a decision if he does have an interaction with that person. Once he's made that decision he acts on it. He does have a responsibility.

Comment: I would answer the question put to Jerry in this manner. One who interacts for better or worse has an effect. He therefore is morally obligated to accept the fact that he will have influence and in that respect be responsible for it.

J. Kagan: That's right; to deny that you have responsibility here is silly.

Comment: I think the big factor with regard to therapy and the therapist relationship and the only model the therapist can assume is to assume the role as therapist as responsibly as he knows how. I think this is the only model that you can really project into the relationship. But this is quite different from straining for the presentation of a model, within the relationship.

D. Tiedeman: The crux of the questions is not how do we produce a specific poet or something of this type, but how do we produce people who are free and responsible? I think if you could talk about your theory of models in relation to getting this but taking it one step further, which I don't think either of you did this morning, to deal with the educational problem of creating critical periods, the problem of initiation as well as the problem of responding to, this for me is the crux of one of these questions that I see you avoiding answering.

J. Kagan: Let me respond briefly. To be against freedom and responsibility is to be for sin, and so obviously I'm for it. Your question is, how do you get it? One of the points I tried to make this afternoon is that you don't get this by making decisions for an organism. I'm not sure of all the ways that you get it, but in terms of my personal experience, I feel one way you can facilitate it is through your behavior as a model.

I'd like to illustrate this with a concrete example. Antioch men, the students who come to the university, tend to be in great measure bright rebellious men who are irresponsible; it attracts that kind of male adolescent, in contrast to the females it attracts. Once every two or three years, I on purpose take as a

research assistant a kid who I think is very bright and salvageable of whom everybody in the psychology department at Fels says, "This kid has been irresponsible for four years." I am aware completely of my role as a model, and this is conscious in many ways. In the first place, I like him; I start out with a strong desire to salvage this man and a warm feeling toward him. That's where we begin. And I do things I wouldn't ordinarily do because I want this need gratified. I'm warm toward him, of course; I have a basic feeling this way, and I behave with tremendous responsibility. And I salvage three out of three. These kids have gone on to graduate school and professors have said, "I don't know how you did it." This is not mystical at all, because he sees me as commanding very desirable goals; he sees me as a hero in a sense. I think young people want heroes; they're consistently confronted with heroes with clay feet, and that makes them terribly disgusted. There is no more idealistic time than between 10 and 18. Young people really want a hero to copy. If you give them this hero and a strong relationship with such a hero, it works. And then they begin to behave responsibly through a kind of an identification with you, and I say, this is done very consciously. It doesn't always work; I selected the ones where I thought the prognosis was very good.

R. May: Jerry, you say they've always had heroes with clay feet; but you have clay feet; I have clay feet; and I find as a therapist who works intensively with people over several years, that many of them - in fact most of my patients - are exceedingly bright, sophisticated people. There is not the slightest doubt that they'll find my clay feet and find them soon. And I regard it as a positive thing that they do.

We have to make a distinction here between intensive psychotherapy and guidance. I'm not talking at this moment about guidance. I'm thinking, "Is it true that the therapist must be the right or good model for the therapist?" I myself have known three really great therapists in my day - Alfred Adler, Frieda von Reichmann, and Harry Stack Sullivan. Each one of these three was an awfully poor model as a human being. Nobody would want to copy them; I can't think of a problem that Frieda had failed to solve, except the fact that she was a tremendously good, responsible and gifted psychiatrist and psychoanalyst. The same thing is true about Harry Stack Sullivan. If anyone took him for a model, God help him. In many ways he was an impossible man to get along with. The only way you could take these two as models was if you wanted to be exactly as they were -- namely a psychiatrist or psychoanalyst. And neither of them would permit that for a minute, either, incidentally. The one thing that these three people had in common was that they were all tremendously responsible and devoted as therapists.

In a talk down in New York a month ago I came out against this model business and a man whom I had analyzed several years before, a very good friend of mine now, and a man for whom I have tremendous respect, called me up and said, "You come out too strongly there because you will recall, you were a model for me." Now this was all perfectly conscious in our work together. It so happens that this professional man had had a father who was unethical and continually bragged about it. I give the impression that I am ethical. His therapy was the first time this guy had ever really dealt continuously and intimately with someone who he thought was ethical. I wasn't an ethical model. I've clay feet; he knows it as well as anybody. But he needed this in me and it was there. As a matter of fact this is one of the sine qua non's of any good therapist. If you're not honest, I am thoroughly convinced that the patient will know it, even though he may not dare say so. I was a model, as he says,

but I was a model, not by virtue of the province of therapy, but by virtue of what this man needed.

This takes me back to Dave Tiedeman's question -- in the long run our responsibility is to transcend the value system of the culture (I speak now of therapists; I don't know how far you could do this as guidance counselors) and to be possibly the only people these patients will ever meet who are interested in them so far as is humanly possible.

Comment: I agree profoundly with Rollo that you can't offer something which you aren't authentically. Which leads me to comment that the guidance worker as opposed to the free lance therapist, is in a very real sense a company man.

J. Kagan: I would agree completely; you cannot be what you are not. In the example I suggested, if I really didn't like this guy, were really not a responsible person, nothing would have happened, of course.

Comment: Let me continue in connection with this company man idea. There is a wholesome, therapeutic, and honest way, I think, of being a guidance man all the while you are accepting your salary to be a company man. Somehow you can straddle two values to recognize the legitimate man in the social system who pays your salary and to have a commitment to the well being and growth of this person. You can do this if you are for the growth and well being of this person and still know the limitations of your own job. If I'm a model, it's an unwitting model.

Comment: I think as a social scientist I might accept the percentage basis on which Jerry's theory of models depends, for solving certain problems; I don't think as a counselor I could work on percentages.

J. Kagan: I don't agree. A few months ago on a plane I read some lectures by a Nobel Laureate-- a physicist. He said the problem with psychologists was that we don't realize in our pursuit of cause-effect relationships similar to those in the physical sciences that we cannot predict for individuals. When physicists talk about gases, they have a billion cases involved. A psychologist should not be so depressed at the impossibility of trying to predict for the individual. No physicist in his right mind would, given all the conditions, predict where one piece of paper would fall. Psychological research often deals in terms of 30 individuals, no physicist would predict in terms of 30 molecules. He'd say, "That's absurd; give me a billion molecules and I'll predict." That's why in our experiment with the male teacher I would say: if 60% of the kids, the boys in the 1st grade learn to read better in contrast to 20% of control group, the results are heartening.

Comment: My feeling is that model choice is an internal process. In the TV situation, for example, most of the kids use the policeman as the model; every once in a while we find one who chooses the criminal. In my own school experience the only teacher who stimulated me intellectually and influenced me was a girl who got fired at the end of the year for two reasons - a moral problem and because she wouldn't get a certificate.

C. Herring: The guidance counselor has a great handicap. Because he very often is the last man in the line of would-be models - parents and teachers who have ignored the problem of hypocrisy, conscious or unconscious, in our

culture, and its effect on adolescents. This is something I have uncovered in my handling of adolescents - the tremendous concern they have about hypocrisy. Remember in Catcher in the Rye on every other page Holden used the word "phony, I mean it, I really do." Adolescents tell me that growing up is just learning to be a better hypocrite. This is what they have seen.

Comment: I think I am not so disturbed as some of my colleagues about this model idea, Jerry. I think maybe what they are implying is that when a counselor serves as a model there has to be a sort of one-to-one matching of traits of counselor to the individual. Whereas it seems to me that your definition of what is encompassed in the process of identification does not imply this at all. What you imply is that in order for someone to be established as a model and to serve as one does not mean one-to-one matching, it means that he meets other conditions.

J. Kagan: He commands those goals that the individual wants, although he may look different, be compulsive or not compulsive, it's the command of those desired goal states that's important. One of the important things is that he command power and that he not be a phony. I think this is extremely important.

H. Cowley: I have two questions. No. 1: Jerry, don't you mean that everyone of us is to a degree a model for everybody and that when there are permanent relationships, then there is identification? No. 2 is whether or not you need to talk about negative models - as when you see a person and say, "Thank God I'm not like him, and I'm not gonna be like him."

J. Kagan: Yes, I'm sorry we haven't talked about that yet. To the first let me say that we have not emphasized the third condition that I stated this afternoon. That is, the individual perceives some basis of similarity already existing between himself and the model; I believe if this doesn't exist, there will be no identification. For example, a child who has an overly autocratic, terribly task-competent father who so dwarfs the child that he feels in a sense, "That mountain is not climbable. I see no similarity; I cry; he never cries. I feel helpless; he never designates to me that he is ever helpless." I think this is what Rollo meant when he said, you've got to show once in a while that you're stupid.

If the individual can feel he shares some of the model's traits, then there is motivation to begin identification. You won't get identification if there isn't a perception of similarity, some starting degree of overlap where the individual feels, "I share something with him."

We know all the problems with ethnic and racial identification which involve negative models; that is, you feel you have the traits of a model, and if those traits are negative, socially undesirable traits, then you begin to believe, although there is no rational reason for this, that you indeed have those traits - you really are stupid; you really are unreliable, merely because the model with whom you have an identification has those traits. I think negative self-models are terribly important; I don't think we've emphasized them because there is an underlying concern with how we better the child.

The child believes that he is incompetent, that he is irresponsible, that he's a cheat, etc., because of an already existing identification with the model. Now he confronts the counselor; the counselor is not a negative model, but the counselor won't get an identification with him. In this sense, the counselor

is a bad - but not a negative - model.

R. May: Otto Rank knew more about these things we are talking about than almost anybody but he couldn't communicate it. He points out that "will" is always negative as well as positive. You may decide for something but you may also decide against something and the implication for therapy is - I don't propose it - but the implication is that often if the therapist takes a stand for something, he can be sure the patient will take a stand against it. I think this is acting a role, but I think that at least in theory it is true. This is why in intensive psychotherapy the anger, the hatred, towards the therapist must come out and the good thing about this is that it isn't just transference and protection. There are things in the therapist that somebody ought to dislike; I never notice them in myself but I assume this to be true. So we are dealing with something more complex; the person reacts against you and he ought to. There must be leeway for this. It is said that the healthiest moment is when your child can say "no" to you. Whether it's healthiest or not, I think it's an essential moment. He can stand against us. It is essential for his self development.

Comment: I would like to respond to the feeling that several people have expressed that if you provide models, then you are somehow interfering with the person's freedom. I don't believe that is true and I think there is a very convenient procedure to avoid that problem. If you simply find out from the client: How do you wish to behave, what is your idea of the ideal person you want to be?" Then you say, all right, let's see if we can figure out some ways of helping you be this way. One way might be to provide a suitable model. I don't think this necessarily means that you provide a model the traits of whom he mimics entirely. You can say, "Here is a model that illustrates one kind of behavior that I think you want to engage in."

Question: What if you disagree profoundly with the idea which he espouses; for instance, he wants to be a master manipulator?

Question: I feel you are responsible for making some value judgments, if the model that he chooses is one that you feel is undesirable.

R. May: You'd say to him, John, "Let's see what model would help you be what you want to be." I think that he always brings this up himself; I don't think you have to give models to anybody. I'm speaking of all of us; we have models all over the place.

Question: Why not deliberately provide models? If an individual wants to behave in a certain way, why are we so afraid of letting him be the kind of person he wants to be?

R. May: Don't use blaming words like "why are we afraid to" because it isn't that we're afraid to. But this is what I meant this morning about symbols, you can never give a person a symbol; it just doesn't work; it doesn't have the power for them. What you can do is to work with their symbols. Anybody you work with will have all kinds of models. These will have power for him. And the model you have chosen certainly won't.

Comment: I wanted to make two points and get some help on them. One, Jerry, is that I have been somewhat confused on the singular and unitary nature of these models; they have been discussed in the singular since 2:15 this afternoon. I cannot think that people are so simple in structure that they emulate unitary

models and yet I have never heard any discussion on the multiplicity of models upon which people pattern themselves -- a little of dad, some of mother, some of an aunt. The second point I want to raise is that we have talked too much about being a model when what really counts is what we are perceived to be and not what we are. And then I want to get into literature by quoting six lines:

"Whenever Richard Cory went down town,
We people on the pavement looked at him:

....., we thought that he was everything
To make us wish that we were in his place.

And Richard Cory, one calm summer night,
Went home and put a bullet through his head."

Comment: I think we are a little too much concerned with the possibility that we as guidance people function as models. I suppose we do. But I think that one of the implications for this postulate that human organisms do identify with models is that those of us who are concerned with guiding human development probably have to insure that a large number of models are available for kids. One of the problems that we are confronted with for a sizable portion of our population is the unitary quality of the models to which they are exposed. If we want to expand their horizons for them, we've got to enrich the models from which they can choose.

The second point I want to comment on is to point to something that seems like a contradiction here. Rollo May has made reference to the Franz Alexander study in which we were reminded that we tend to pick out of our perceptions things that we think are important to us even when it is necessary to distort them. A couple of days ago my wife called my attention to a new book. I don't remember its name, but she says that one of the interesting things about the 75 outstanding people whose history had been traced in the book (some of them were infamous, some of them were famous, but all were people who seemed to have the capacity of identifying themselves as separate from the mass) was not the stable families from which they came, but the fact that there tended to be instability in their families. So there is apparently nothing about stable families that necessarily means they are good models. Yet we tend to point to a stable and solid family as the model for kids. Jerry, I want to ask you what do these two possible findings mean in your concepts of a model and its relationship to development?

J. Kagan: Let me comment on the latter. I have two hobbies; one is the origin of the Western concept of love, and if anybody has any interesting history books on it, I'd be fascinated to have some more references. The other is how scientists develop into scientists. As I read biographies and the comments on them, I am struck with the possibility that one of the consequences of their families' instability was rejection of their parents as a direct model and choice of a fictional hero as model. They may have chosen Einstein or Newton rather than their father. This is sheer speculation; but in very stable families, if the boy says, "My father is the greatest," the father becomes the model and in most cases he emulates the achievement of the father. That lowers the goal.

Comment: My comment relates back to the reaction that John Krumboltz had: I would be interested, Dr. May, in further elaboration on the point of the responsibility of the counselor for the client's or student's decision. I was not entirely satisfied with the illustration you used in responding earlier to

this point where you touched upon a school environment which a counselor might feel constrained to support -- rather I would think of the kind of decision-making that might be within the scope of the client himself to handle, like deciding whether or not to attend college. To what extent, in your framework, would the counselor have a responsibility for a greater degree of influence?

R. May: If I understand your question correctly, I think the counselor's responsibility is not to influence this chap. Now we have the idea it's better to go to college. But all the great writers, you find, dropped out of college. I don't think there is any reason that it is better to go to college. I would say that, then, my job, were I a counselor, would be to help the student be aware of all of the implications of the situation but not to influence his decision..

Question: Suppose he wants to commit suicide?

R. May: That's a question that is always asked; and let us say right off the bat that it is by and large an abstract question because suicide is really a very rare thing except with psychotics and the raising of the question of suicide is, in general, in almost all cases, a very different thing from the tendency toward the suicide act. As a matter of fact, the two of them tend more to be opposites, than to go together. If a client does want to commit suicide, my task is to see and to help him see what he means by this, let us say, excepting psychotics--I speak now clinically. We are relatively sure that practically always this is a symbolic statement of discouragement, defiance, probably defiance more than discouragement, a testing of the therapist. With patients it is kind of a ultimate test of whether the therapist really respects their right to choose to live or not to live.... and I must say I do my best always to respect it. I've never had a suicide; nobody I know who takes my point of view has. But I would be very frank in saying I must give the client the right to decide this in long terms. Again, I would except psychotics and children. If you want to read a statement on this that will make you very angry, but I think is the best statement I know of on this problem, read Binswanger's case of Ellen West. This is a case that he wrote up specifically to demonstrate that a person has the right himself to decide to take or not to take his life.

Question: What if the decision affects someone else...suppose the person contemplates murder, let us say? I'm trying to give an extreme example here...

R. May: Well, this always comes up too. This is where the clinical experience of the therapist does matter; we have to ask ourselves and we have to know as much as we can about whether this is a real possibility or not. With a psychopath, it may be. I think, however, that our great tendency in this culture is to lean over backwards to protect the patient from these things, or to think we are protecting society. I can say this because, again, the question of somebody planning murder who is in therapy is very, very rare, but I would frankly come out flat-footed, that so far as I humanly can see, except with a person with psychosis where you cannot take the responsibility, I would respect his responsibility.

Comment: I would like to take exception to something that Rollo said. In his discussion of suicide, I think he passed rather lightly over children and psychotics. As a matter of fact, I think this may give the wrong impression, because children are in school and counselors do deal with them. The possibility of suicide is sometimes a real problem with children, with adolescents.

They may or may not be psychotic; they may be intangibly psychotic the time they attempt or commit suicide but next week they may not be. I think one can't just dismiss them and say, "They're psychotics and therefore must be treated entirely differently." This is not a permanent stage. One can have a neurotic depression which may have psychotic phases. I think that you give the impression that one can treat it lightly.

R. May: I appreciate your saying this. Obviously you're right; and I did give too much that impression. Also I was speaking of my clients, a group which are not adolescents or children.

Comment: But you did not say children when psychotic; you said children and psychotics.

R. May: This is actually what I said, Clovis. I did not mean to include children and adolescents in my too sweeping statement, because I think there are other things at work there.

J. Kagan: Could I add something to that, because I agree completely? On the notion of freedom and responsibility, Rollo and I are much closer than it may appear. I agree completely that with the adult, certainly he must make the decision, but with the young organism it is important that we understand how far we can push it.

Comment: There is a question on negative models which has interested me for a long time and I wonder if both Dr. May and Dr. Kagan would comment on it. I can probably best illustrate this with examples: one girl will come in presenting her mother as a very negative model, very selfish and domineering. Yet this girl herself is quite obviously very selfish and domineering. Or a boy comes in presenting his father as a very negative model, someone whom one thinks of as power mad. It comes out that the boy is a power-oriented individual himself. On the question of how this is acquired and what is going on, I think you both might have something to say.

R. May: On the surface, before we get below it, wouldn't our first two hypotheses be fairly obvious -- that this may be an endeavor of the client to avoid looking at these traits in himself and that the client is projecting these undesirable traits on others? We don't know if these are the cases but they may well be.

J. Kagan: Yes, I would agree with both those statements, we very well know that a daughter of a domineering, autocratic mother who vows she will never be like this with her daughter, ends up being like this because, when she is six or seven, during the phase of identification when her mother possesses some of those desired goals that she wants, she adopts those traits which do then become part of her.

R. May: You get this also in treating psychotics; they reject people who are exactly like themselves.

E. Lloyd-Jones: May I ask both of you, Rollo and Jerry, in what way you disagree with this formulation that all of us here are concerned with -- that the young should, through some kind of dynamics, learn how to live. There is no way, I think you're saying, for learning these lessons excepting as these qualities that are pretty abstract -- love, responsibility, exercise of freedom, all the other things we've been talking about -- are made concrete in living persons. That with children, these qualities must or will be incorporated for them meaningfully in

those individuals who are closest to them, on whom they are dependent, who are their most significant people in their environment. Progressively individuals don't have to have a unitary kind of model. I always listen to ourselves in this kind of group with some skepticism because I have a feeling we like to dramatize ourselves as a model. I think we are to our little children and we must be to those who come to us and for whom we must mean a great deal to make up the deficiency in their learning. But I'm sure that I've heard bright, normal college youngsters and young adults with whom I've worked say to me, "This quality as exemplified in this person has meaning for me." "I am trying to find out how to incorporate this into my life....this other person whom I might have seen in history; whom I have followed through in a piece of literature, whom I have seen as a classmate, etc...this I do want; I will reject this: this is a negative quality for me." The person is constructing, trying to turn himself into a model in a sense, an image of himself which he is constructing out of a lot of these qualities made real in different persons.

Comment: This comment is of a more global nature, but it seems to me our discussion about models in relation to motivation and behavior has assumed that they have an all-around sort of effect. The question is, aren't there other factors which influence and change behavior and motivate excellence, sometimes to a greater degree than the model? The model is one of the factors, perhaps, that molds a youngster's behavior, but not the only factor. Isn't it a matter of difference in time, intensity, developmental stages and so on?

J. Kagan: Of course. I said very specifically, "Let's talk about only one factor."

Comment: My comment relates to what Esther said. I think the theory of models is dissonant with the theory of self-being. I'm sure you don't mean it this way, Jerry, but I feel we need clarification on this. If we're going to help someone to be himself, even if he uses models partly, part of our function as a counselor would be to help him to discard models or if not to discard models, to help him to unfold himself. This process of the unfolding, I think, is one of the things which may account for one great amount of variance not accounted for in the data which you've presented in your paper. I'd like to illustrate this point, if I may, with a quotation from literature, a story in the Talmud of a pious Moses who lived in the city of Berdichev who wept and wailed on a high holy day; since he was so pious, he was heard by his God. The Lord God looked down upon him and said, "Why do you, my pious son, weep and wail?" Moses said, "I weep because I am not as great as our great leader, Moses." God hearing him, replied in a gentle voice, "But I am not asking you to be that one; I'm only asking you to be Moses of Berdichev." The second quotation is from Ogden Nash who tells of the lament of the seagull who weeps because he is not an eagull, "Suppose you were, you silly seagull, how would you explain it to your shegull?"

Question: Relating to the choice of models: I feel hung up on this point. A high percentage of children, given freedom to choose a model, already have had experience in school that would make the kind of models we are somewhat antagonistic towards them or difficult for them to accept. This being so, it could make schooling and academic life and success in the academic world truly difficult for them. Does freedom of choice in that instance actually represent freedom for them or are there areas in the field of guidance where we need to assume some responsibility either in helping to change the educational process so that this kind of identification isn't so difficult for them, or through some other kinds of intervention?

.....

Question: Dr. May, what do you mean by "influence"? It seems to me this is the very essence of any counselor's job or therapist's. Yet many times therapists have said, "I do not influence." It seems to me that you do. Would you care to explain?

R. May: Certainly I do. But to overstate it slightly, I think that by and large my influence is a failure of therapy rather than its success. What Dr. Lloyd-Jones said fits in here. I think it's the job of a therapist (and when I was a counselor I did this also as far as it was possible in the situation) to help the client draw out and experience his own potentialities and to use these potentialities. There may be influencing in that, by the way, but I don't think the influencing should be the central process. Whatever influence I have on the client I want to bring into awareness so that his potentialities will be as far as possible experienced by him as his, rather than his feeling that these are what I value.

C. Chandler: I want to make a comment; I think one of the reasons we're a little bit hung up is that, although we are talking and caring about the same things - that is taking the responsibility of eliciting from children, patients, and so on their optimal something or other - we fail to make a differentiation between counseling and therapy, and I think this is vital. Counselors are disadvantaged in many respects because the crucial quality that the therapist brings is healing, not preceptorship. We don't have to get caught as therapists in the teaching aspects, the model building aspect, even though we may be models. So in a sense we are freer. This is one of the difficulties we are facing in making this differentiation.

N. Hobbs: Let's not leave till we give Rollo an opportunity to back off three notches from immediate questions to pick up anything that has become fairly central to him as we have talked. Rollo, won't you do that for us?

R. May: I'm aching to. I quite realize that something done at this hour of the night on a sense of one's own responsibility, which is often one's own egocentricity, is almost bound to be the wheat dropped on the stony ground. But let me do it for my own relief, if for nothing else. I have to leave tomorrow. If I were to be around longer, I'd lie in wait for a more objective time. I do, however, want to clarify a couple of things that I think are misunderstood.

I appreciate very much your statement, and this I carry heavily on my heart, that we haven't made a distinction between therapy and counseling. That is chiefly my fault. I have spoken very frankly today as a man who has been working in intensive psychotherapy for many years. I think that what I have said today is translatable to counseling, but I certainly haven't done it. Half the questions I got were like: Should the counselor be a therapist? Well, I think he certainly should not be. If not, is there anything the counselor can do? I think there's a great, great deal he can do in terms of all the kinds of problems you can formulate as easily as I, the kinds of situations. I very much value what you are doing.

If I talk about my own profession, it is only because it is what I know best. I don't know as much about yours as you do. I would want you to make very clear these distinctions. I wouldn't want you to have the slightest bit of feeling that, unless you go into it as intensively as we psychoanalysts, somehow you're falling short. That is not the point at all. I feel that you yourself can

clarify these distinctions as you go along this week.

There is another misunderstanding that, Jerry, I'd make as clear as I can because it is quite fundamental. You gave me some very creative moments as I took a walk on the road this afternoon. I got to some new understandings of "being" in relation to models and standards. Adolescents hunt for diversity of models or for qualities that I think, if I understand the picture, are the person's endeavor to bring out and possibly project his own potentialities. It doesn't have to be a copying of somebody.

This morning in my paper I learned again that we always hit a problem with the term "being". It's almost indefinable, but nevertheless we've got to use it. There is no other way to express the ultimate form of what we are as human beings. The way I would define it is "pattern of potentialities". This afternoon, Jerry, you mentioned that this was correlated with a particular idea of ideal model. I said this morning that I could, in talking, give way to the tendency to trim one's sails, do what would be most acceptable, etc. -- I used a very strong but very accurate term called "dishonesty". This would be a loss of "being".

It wouldn't be a loss of being with reference to standards. I think the standard presents the problem that Dave Tiedeman was talking about. Always when we formulate, we tend to do it in outside terms, because that's how an idea can be formulated most easily. Standards are, I think, more or less outside. A denial of my being, a loss of my being, on the other hand, in this instance, would have been giving up the pleasure of stating a slightly new original idea that could be formed only as I communicate it with you. Giving up communicating this idea to this particular group in this particular world would be giving up the pleasure that comes with the expansion of myself, my being. There are aspects of this that don't have any relationships to standards, but must be related, it seems to me, to the experience of a human being living out his potentialities, or denying them. Esther, I think you were talking about it when you spoke of this person experiencing his potentialities and then finding his model. In his paper, Dave Tiedeman says something about the dialogue of self and model. It's not the model but the dialogue with it. The healthier, the more constructive a model is, the more it represents what I genuinely am, the more it is consonant with my potentialities and my being. And this is a testable hypothesis.

This afternoon in our discussion of femininity and how hard it is for women to develop their potentialities within our culture's standards, Esther Westervelt gave a sentence there that hit me like a rainbow. She said if a woman is comfortable with herself as a woman, then she can negotiate these problems much better. Now this is a statement of being and an excellent one. Here we are talking about a level of experience that is below standards. If a woman is comfortable with herself as a woman, she can more successfully withstand the standards in our culture, which tend to take away her femininity. In this sense, being is what gives you a sense of integration and helps you stand against the negative cultural standards.

Let me say also, so that I can sleep tonight, that I also have it on my conscience that I haven't talked about research. Among the questions was "Give us one testable hypothesis derived from your idea of the gap between stimulus and response." I think such hypotheses can be formulated. I have a couple myself but I'm not the best man at formulating testable hypotheses for research. I don't apologize for it; it's not my line. I have other ways of testing, in therapy, etc. Nevertheless, I can see much of value in testing through formal experiments. Carl Rogers, at the APA meeting, said most psychologists will abhor the generality and obscurity of Rollo May's propositions, but I've had no difficulty at all in formulating these into testable hypotheses. He meant he can abhor them even while he likes them.

Solon T. Kimball

While the rest of you were getting some of your anxieties settled about money, and reimbursement problems and how long sessions should be, my anxiety was being extended in terms of the moment of great truth which was being put off, you see, by all of ten minutes or so. I was all prepared, so I could sit here and seem ready for the kickoff, but not quite ready to kick off. In the session that we had on Saturday before the conference began, there was discussion among us about the fact that we should play things by ear, take the temper of the group, be adjustable, flexible in these situations as they arose. And so in that spirit yesterday afternoon at the close of the session when the discussion got around to the subject of sex, and I began to see tempers rise and hostilities erupt, I decided that that should be my subject because obviously you were more interested in sex than in a lot of other things and therefore I should deal with this topic.

Furthermore, there was another reason for this shift in my plans which was that Rollo May to a certain extent talked about sex, as is appropriate for anyone who is interested in psychotherapy because it gets in there all the time, and that Jerry Kagan informed us that psychologists had finally discovered males and females. But we anthropologists have been dealing with this subject for decades. In fact, this is the way we wormed our way into the institutions, through sex. And not only that, but there's an old and hoary story which states the case very well indeed, and this was the great turning point in the history of anthropology because the story concerns the definition of anthropology which, as you well know, is the study of man. A professor of anthropology was giving a public lecture; this was in the days when we still had women suffragettes around and when there were far more women getting Ph.D's than now are. One woman rose and protested this definition as being discriminatory and exclusive. This man

was very fast on his feet and he said, "We shall as of now amend this definition to read, 'Anthropology is the study of man embracing woman'."

So with these credentials and the fact that I would not give up the prior right that we have to the discussion of sex, I decided to talk about sex. Then I decided not to. And if you will permit, I shall tell the reason for this. The truth of the matter is that when Margaret Mead published her book Male and Female in about 1954 or 55, that ended anthropological interest in sex. The proof of this is in the fact that four years ago when I was asked by the chairman of the planning committee for the annual program of the American Anthropological Society, I said to the chairman, "Have you looked at this year's papers? Have you looked at the papers we presented last year and the year before? Not a single paper at an anthropology meeting had anything to do with sex. What's wrong with us?" And so we looked, and it was true, and so we devoted one half day of the session the following year to sex, if for no other purpose than to re-establish our priority in the subject.

However, it is true that the field of anthropology at least in its public sense has been paying less attention to sex and much more to other fields. An example of this is its interest in education. Others include the study of small groups, of large organizations, and the application of anthropological techniques to specific problems of ongoing systems, and in addition to this, and very particularly by at least a small group of us, a direct interest in the nature of American society and contemporary civilization.

Now playing it by ear also made me realize that I had to have a quotation from literature. So my quotation is: "To be or not to be." Being or not being — a theme I must thank Rollo May for. My theme will be both symbolic and diabolic. I'm quite serious about this because the first part of what I'm going to discuss is what you may very appropriately call diabolic.

We move now from looking at the individual, from looking at his characteristics, from how he operates and how people operate in terms of him, to looking at institutions, social patterns, and organization. I should like first to pay attention to the characteristics of small groups, and I do this not so much because of its importance as subject matter, although this is an important field for guidance. I do it primarily for the purpose of illustrating the methods of research which anthropology uses, and by showing their application in small group research, to indicate some differences between sociology and psychology, on the one hand, and anthropology on the other.

The interest of anthropologists in small groups is, of course, very old. From the very beginning anthropologists were concerned with the simple, primitive groupings in which people lived, a form of organization which we came to call the "band". The band consists of a group of families who are semi-sedentary among whom all of the necessary functions of life could be met; the crises of birth and death, the initiation of the young into manhood or womanhood, education, the provision of food, etc. etc. Those of you who are not acquainted with Ralph Linton's chapter on band organization in his Study of Man, one of the classic books in anthropology, should read it, because most of the thirteen principles which he lists there as the characteristics of the primitive band are equally applicable to the organization of the student peer group structure in a high school or, if you will, to clique structure among teachers. Most of you are acquainted with the concepts of status and role and here again I recommend the chapter on status and role by Ralph Linton. It has been a great stimulus to investigations in both sociology and psychology.

There is an additional reason to be concerned with small group study because it provides a contrast between sociology and anthropology. In my paper you will recall I referred to the method of natural history as not the only method but the basic method within anthropological research. The method of natural history

is old, of course, and in its early stages primarily emphasized taxonomy. The contribution of Charles Darwin, however, gave us a most extraordinary intellectual procedure for understanding the dynamics of organic systems. I have become increasingly convinced (and the evidence continues to accumulate) that the natural history method poses a radical alternative to what may be called the method of physical science in the examination of the world around us.

I cannot present the evidence to substantiate my point because this requires a presentation in itself. But there are two or three things to which I do wish to call your attention to illustrate how the natural history method is different from the method of the physical sciences. It differs in its use of the concept of time. Natural history, by its very definition, is concerned with systems from origin to conclusion: We observe institutions, families, and events within a time span -- a time span which is, by the way, much more than calendar time or clock time because it's a time span which human societies through their capacities to create symbols, establish for themselves.

Thus we can examine, if you will, the natural history of a small group in a girls' dormitory at the University of Alabama and later on I shall return to describe this specific study. In another study at the same university our problem was the effect of crisis upon the dissolution of small groups. This student sought to discover the impact of final examinations, and the rapid depletion of a dormitory population when students went home upon a once stable clique system. She observed what happened in the reformulations of these once very stable groups, as their membership disappeared. This girl is now playing a very significant part in the area of mental health in the state of Georgia. This study exemplifies one of the distinguishing characteristics of the natural history method. You observe behavior over time in order to understand even one event within the total cycle.

A second major difference is that in anthropology we do not use the concept

of the continuum. Some of you yesterday were talking about the continuum which ranged from extreme boredom on the one hand to panic on the other with something else scattered in between -- I was never quite sure what. Anthropologists, with one exception, do not use this kind of structural approach in organizing data. The exception is Robert Redfield, who came into anthropology out of law and the humanities and represents in very large measure another one of our traditions, the humanitarian one. But he also found and borrowed from the sociologists, from Tönnies and Durkheim the concept of the continuum and utilized it in his arrangement of society on a typology ranging from the folk society to urban society. But this is rather unusual.

It isn't that we can't use the continuum, it isn't that it is not a desirable device or that it is not useful -- this is not the point. The point is that we are interested in patterns, in structures, and in the operation of these patterns and structures as observed in events. Therefore, we are looking at dynamic wholes; we do not emphasize the distribution of items or traits on a bi-polar axis.

There is another aspect of natural history which I should mention here which is of tremendous relevance to our discussion of last night and to the whole field of the method of research and of theories of learning. It is this -- no one can see what he has not been trained to see. Where this principle was first stated I don't know -- but Charles Darwin at least discovered it for himself. He discovered it as a result of an expedition that he and a professor of his, a geologist from Cambridge University, took to Wales where Darwin was to learn the techniques of stratification which he was to use eventually as naturalist on the voyage of the Beagle. This was in 1830. The principles explaining the deposition of terminal moraines, of glacial detritus, of the striations engraved upon boulders carried by the ice, were not then known. Later on, as a consequence of the work of the great geologist, Agassiz, all the principles involved in

glaciation were made explicit. However, as Darwin commented later, the evidence of previous glaciation was even more apparent than if the glacier had itself been there. But neither his professor nor he was then trained to see what to later scientists was obvious.

I bring this point up to illustrate that each student and each person doing research can see only that which he has been trained to see. Our perceptive system is related to what Gregory Bateson, in a classic article of about twenty years back, called deuterio learning. We are concerned with learning in anthropology and with personality but our approach is different than that of psychology, and vastly different from the treatment of anxiety about which you were hearing yesterday. In deuterio learning the infant must learn to learn and the process by which he learns to learn differs from one culture to the next. In the process of learning to learn he also learns to discriminate. Therefore, into each new experience the individual brings those patterns of discrimination, and categories of knowledge through which he interprets the new situation.

Perception is culturally built into each person and, in a sense, is a reflection of the cultural values of male and female, of old and young, and of the other institutional arrangements with which all of us have to deal. This is also important because part of the problem that we have had in anthropology in training our research people is the problem of getting them to see much which they had never seen before and also getting them to see things differently than previously.

With this kind of an introduction I should like to turn next to the problem raised by Mr. McCully of the appropriateness of anthropology as compared with sociology for the study of institutions, and the question he also raised of whether or not we can easily dispose of problems of sampling, statistical correlations and items of this kind. I should like to make a contrast between the report on the study of small groups by James Coleman published in The Adolescent

Society and a report on a study of small groups as conducted by an anthropologist. In this discussion we will be dealing mostly with substantive material, but we will also be dealing with certain problems of ethics, and we will be dealing with the problem of differences between anthropology and sociology, and the research methods within anthropology.

In his book Coleman says first of all that there are such things as teenage societies. Now anthropologists would use the term "society" rather differently. We would not call what he calls a "teenage society" a society. We would call this age-graded behavior. This may be a purely semantic problem, but as far as our definitions are concerned, it is a significant one. We reserve the word "society" for the whole of institutionalized relationships among people.

Coleman goes on to say that these teenage societies are cut off from adult society probably more than ever before. And now I'm quoting: "Our society has within its midst a set of small teen-age societies, which form teen-age interests and attitudes on things far removed from adult responsibilities, and which may develop standards that lead away from those goals established by the larger society."¹ He goes on to say that this separation of teenage society from adult society is undoubtedly increasing, is greater than it has been ever before, and that something should be done about it.

Now what he proposes to do about it is as follows, and here I paraphrase him. He asserts that we should lead teenagers in the directions which adult society seeks. He never explains exactly which adult society; whether it's the John Birch society or whether it's the extreme Left, or whether it's Southern society, or Northeastern society or which society it is, but in any event he assumes that there is such a thing, as you can see. And then he says there is a conflict between parent and child -- and in this regard he's quite correct; there

¹James Coleman, The Adolescent Society, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1961, p.9.

is a conflict which in our kind of civilization is not to be gotten rid of, but which it is absolutely necessary to continue. But he says, and I quote: "Efforts can be made to redirect the whole society of adolescence itself, so that it comes to motivate the child in directions sought by the adult society."²

Well, first I would have to quarrel with Coleman regarding his interpretation of American society. Apparently he has never read Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn, Penrod and Sam, nor has he read the autobiographies of William Allen White, John Ise and the other Americans of the period of the 1890s and early 1900s, because certainly the fictional documents as well as the autobiographies indicate very clearly that just the contrary to what Coleman says is happening is happening today. In this earlier period there was a true and far more distinct society of the young operating outside the adult world, with relatively little attempt on the part of the adult world to control or to modify it. What actually has been happening is the same thing that's happening in terms of the relationship between men and women in our society which is that of a blurring between what is distinctly male or distinctly female. Hence, part of the problem is the hostilities and the difficulties arising from this failure of proper role definition.

Part of what's happening in our contemporary society is a blurring of the age roles and not a moving away of age groups from one another. It is a blurring that begins with the father taking on boy behavior in play with his son. In the period of the 1890s there was an adult world and there was a child world, and they operated quite distinctly separate except for certain occasions when they came together. Today the father relates himself to the child not at the level of bringing the boy into the adult world, but at the level where the son is at that moment; it is the father who engages in playing with the toys and the blocks and the model trains and building airplanes and so forth -- entering into the kind of life that his son leads, whether it be in elementary school or in the adolescent

²Coleman, Ibid. p.9.

period, by which time, as it was very well stated yesterday, the adolescents are in rebellion and off on their own. This latter period, of course, is what Coleman studied.

I should also make some comments about Coleman's method here. What he attempted to do was extremely worthy, the hypotheses he set up were the kinds of things which were significant things to find out. The process which he used was the process in which you create instruments capable of being handled by machine tabulation and capable of being analysed in terms of "strictly scientific" methods -- the application of statistical devices to determine the legitimacy of conclusions through coefficients of correlations, Chi squares, etc., etc.

This involves problems of sampling and there's been a very great deal worked out on this. The problem of sampling in anthropology is a very different one. It is not a statistical problem. Our problem of sampling in anthropology is a problem of pattern, of system, of events, which is a quite distinct kind of thing. Ordinarily the anthropologist would not have used the kinds of devices which Coleman used. It isn't that these devices don't have their use. It isn't that these devices don't make available to you some understanding of what it is that you are dealing with. It isn't that the methods, within their own logic, are not substantially correct. But after prodigious efforts you are still dealing primarily with a statement of traits and trait distributions within a given population in contrast to behavior as a function of systems. For example -- and I'm afraid this is one of the worst examples, but after reading the first part of Coleman, I was running a very high temperature for reasons which I haven't told you about yet but which I will -- when I came, on page five, to his first statistical comment, I couldn't help having an anthropological perspective, and thus did not feel very kindly toward his statement. On page five he talks about his method. As an example, he comments upon the relation of the élite in the high school system to their parents. He says that the parents of the élite disapprove less

of certain kinds of behavior which were characteristic of the adolescent society in the high school. Now this is the general statement he made. This is the kind of general statement that comes to be quoted, but when you examine Coleman's own figures you discover there is no basis for his assertion. The figures show that, among the élite, 50.2% of the parents disapprove less and 49.8% disapprove more, in contrast to the parents of the non-élite in the highschool, of whom 53.8% disapproved less or more or whatever it is and vice versa. It really doesn't matter which it is, you see, because these figures provide no basis for the generalization he made. And then his next figures for girls show that whereas 52.9% of the girls who are in the élite class did not have parental disapproval, only 48.9% of the girls in the non-élite class did not have parental disapproval, which is, he says, a complete reversal of the boys. This is a kind of a comment with which Coleman is very careless; he shouldn't make statements like this and then present his own figures to disprove them!

I will get to the matter of anthropological methods in a minute -- but let's first talk about Coleman's ethics. This has to do with some of the discussion that was going on last night about what right has anyone to impinge himself on the life of some other person. What right has anyone to say, "Now -- now that we really understand adolescent society since we've made a study of it -- now we're going to tell you people how you can capture it and how you will move this society in the direction that you want it to move -- in particular toward adult standards and the adult world." This is what James Coleman proposes in his first chapter.

Let me make some background statements so that you'll understand that this is not a purely personal matter. In 1940 a group of anthropologists established the Society for Applied Anthropology. Its membership included those who had begun a redirection of their interests some years earlier. It has its origins at Harvard University, in an intellectual environment which included influence from men like Alfred North Whitehead, Elton Mayo, and L.J.Henderson. Its members included those

who were interested in social change and its direction. One of the things which bothered them and has always bothered us is a matter of the ethics of utilizing the knowledge which you gain from research for the manipulation of other people. Out of experience over a period of years, we finally formulated a code of ethics governing our behavior. This code of ethics takes the position that no one has the moral right to attempt to make changes in the organizational system or the lives of others from privileged knowledge unless the same knowledge is also made available to the people with whom one plans to work.

May I say that this is not only a moral and ethical position but a practical one. We had earlier discovered and we have since proved that if you want to make changes, you can do so faster and more effectively this way than if you try to sneak up on people. What I am trying to say is that we have learned that when you bring people fully into a consideration of the goals of an administrative organization and the administrative problems of that organization and the people discuss with the people who are going to be affected by changes the varieties of alternatives and their consequences, then you are likely (it is not always so, but it is more likely than not) to move toward your goals more rapidly than if you attempt to do this by the pure manipulative maneuvers of those who may have special kinds of knowledge. Therefore, on a moral ground I reject completely and fully what James Coleman proposes, and I would hope that you do. May I say that he has been informed of this -- not in quite as strong or detailed language as I am giving you here at this moment -- but James Coleman knows that McClellan and I feel that his way is not the way to do it.

There are many aspects of the Coleman study which are excellent. I would only hope that some of us might get his basic material and work with him to attempt to make some rather different analyses from the ones which he had made. This undoubtedly is the best body of empirical data that is now extant about the nature of the high school student in the high school system now in operation, and

I don't think he has done justice to the material which he has.

I would like next to talk about the anthropological method of small group study. First of all let me give you some background. One of the first studies -- at least the first one with which I am acquainted -- was made in a textile plant in 1922. It was not made by an anthropologist; actually it was made by a social psychologist. This study was one contracted for with the Harvard Business School. This was one of the first instances in which industry went to the academic world and asked what it could do to help. In this particular case, the owner of the factory agreed that an experimental group could carry on any kind of research they wanted to because, as the owner said, it would be impossible to make the situation worse. So Elton Mayo and certain other colleagues went there, and they did some very simple things. They didn't know what they were doing -- and, may I say, this is part of the natural history method. You don't even know the questions that you ought to ask when you begin your research. Oftentimes you don't know what it is that you are seeking or even the procedures that you should follow. You have to build a little ledge and then another little ledge and move from step to step.

This is what they did. They put a nurse in the one department which had a labor turnover of over 100%. She was there to treat small injuries but she also listened to their problems. They instituted some rest periods; they had somebody come in and teach the men how to lie on some burlap bags and go to sleep in a minute or two; they brought in a light lunch. They tried all kinds of variations: they modified the rest periods from five to fifteen minutes, they had three or four rest periods, and then only one. They used the variations to see what effects occurred. And all kinds of things began to happen. This department, which had had a bad production record, began to gradually improve to the level of production which the efficiency engineers said it should have. Labor turnover rates dropped from the highest to the lowest in the factory. Men who had been heavy drinkers,

often absent from work, or who actually quit began to reform. Some even took their wives to the movies.

All kinds of things took place until a crisis came in the production schedule of the factory. At this moment the supervisor wiped out all the innovations on the grounds that the thirty minutes of rest, lunch, etc., should be spent working. What happened then was that the production dropped to a level below where it had been before the changes made by Mayo and his team. Well, it was fortunate that this supervisor did this because this taught the researchers something else. They went to the owner of the factory and they got the authority of the supervisor restricted. They reinstituted some of their innovations, and production went back up but never reached the peak it had before.

Then the researchers tried to figure out what had happened. In after-years I've heard Elton Mayo describe their puzzlement. He said, that in truth they didn't know how to explain what happened, but apparently it was the opportunity of those who were part of the system to participate in its control that made the real difference. This particular principle, if you wish to call it such, has been proven time after time. It has been stated in the literature, taught in classes, but for some reason or another it has never really been utilized.

Among other studies of small groups that have been made, as many of you know, are those about street corner society by Bill Whyte and the studies by Sherif. The small group study which I want to give you in greater detail is the one which we conducted at the University of Alabama -- not the one on the dissolution of dormitory small groups. I was training some of my students in small group observation techniques, in the process by which you analyse the data you gather. It became possible for us to put a girl in a wing of one dormitory for a period of months for the purpose of observing the behavior of the girls in the dormitory to discover a social system. She had learned that there were social systems because we, in our training process had told her there were social systems. Therefore,

she had to find a social system. The particular kind of social system she might find none of us knew.

She went into this particular situation using a technique which is distinctly anthropological although not exclusively so -- we have no monopoly on this -- that of the participant observer, the person who himself becomes part of an on-going group in some well-defined capacity. Now this doesn't mean that if you study elementary grades in a school system you have to become a first grader. It doesn't mean this at all. What it means is that you have a defined position within an on-going organization, which is understood by the others in it, and which makes some sense to them, in that you take part in the group's activities.

As a participant observer she was supposed to look at what kinds of relationships obtained between the girls, that is, which girls borrowed clothes from other girls, which girls shared food with other girls, which girls shared liquor with other girls, which girls went on dates with each other, who studied with whom, who went into whose room with whom, etc. It wasn't alone the question of types of relationships which obtained between these girls. It was also a matter of the timing -- what time of the day did this or that happen and who was involved. It is the information on which you can build. This is your first step -- a typology of types of events, which can be classified under eating or drinking or dating or whatever.

In addition to this, our researcher also collected the kind of information which is standard operating procedure irrespective of your disciplinary training. This procedure is that of collecting a lengthy list of characteristic traits about each girl or subject. And what are these traits? Well, the girls were sophomores, juniors, and seniors. What kind of religion did they have? What size of town did they come from? What size of allowance did they have? What college curricula had they selected? What kinds of grades did they get? etc. These were the trait characteristics.

I have often used this particular case in my teaching. I sometimes give a list of traits for each girl to my students and assign them the problem of manipulating the items in any conceivable way to establish the social structure of the group. They have only trait items available to work from. In most instances the students are unable to find any significant relationship. When they attempt to relate town size, allowance and so forth, there are too many variations and exceptions to make any consistent sense. Religious affiliation does begin to offer clues because you had five girls who were Jewish and all the rest were Protestant. But even here the students went wrong in terms of the nature of the social grouping based upon event behavior. They went wrong because, although trait items may be important, they are not necessarily truly diagnostic of the nature of an ongoing social system.

Let me show you what eventually evolved in this study. One group of four Jewish girls formed one clique. Then, another group of four girls formed another clique. This was the fast set. They smoked, drank, dated frequently and came in after hours on occasions. There was also a group composed of fundamentalists.

Each group had its own internal structure. In each, one girl appeared as the leader. Now what was the key to her leadership? The key to her leadership was not determined by her generosity in loaning clothes or sharing food, but by what kinds of problems other girls brought to her for advice.

Within the structure also appeared two girls who formed a pair. Personal characteristics were a factor both in their rejection and in their seeking each other's company. One of these girls was a pimple-faced fleshy type, who attempted to be friendly with everybody and anybody. She would gladly have joined any one of the groups irrespective of her religious affiliation if anybody would take her in. Nobody would. The other girl was mannish in behavior and liked to wrestle with the other girls if she had a chance. The only one with whom she could ever form any kind of continuing relationship happened to be with this poor little

reject. Hence the explanation for this pair.

We had one complete isolate, a person who was not rejected by the group but who on her own chose to be a loner and who had dedicated herself to the goals of the academic community. She had become completely engrossed in the academic program at the university. And then we had what we called a "floater". This girl happened to be Jewish, but she didn't fit with the Jewish group and she didn't establish close bonds anywhere. If the analysis had stuck to religious membership as a criterion for group membership this instance would have distorted the reality.

Then finally -- and this was the last discovery -- we learned who it was that was the focus of the system. It was a girl who was extremely modest. She was not outstanding at all, and was somewhat in the background all the time. But we discovered that -- this was almost too good to be true -- the girls who were the leaders of the groups took their personal problems to this girl. That is, she was a leader of the leaders. This was the kind of system which we found.

There is one further point here which contrasts with Coleman's material. Coleman says that one of the characteristics of adolescent society in a situation that separates it from the adult society, where peer group values are different from those of the adult society, is that the élite are the élite and the leaders only because they reflect the nature of the people who are members of their group in fuller measure than do the members of the group themselves. Now this finding is generally born out in other studies also, as in Whyte's description of street corner society. But there is something else that Coleman doesn't tell us that appears in other small group studies. It is that the leader is the link between a subordinate group such as students, and the authorities. When crises arose, as, for example, one of the girls in the Alabama study getting caught coming in late, and that particular problem was brought to the leader, what would you expect her advice to be? Her advice was: You work fully, cooperatively, and truthfully

with the administration.

In studies which we made in two of the Alabama prisons we discovered a clique structure among prisoners quite different in its internal arrangements. There were two parallel and competing cliques joined to a comparable faction split on the level of the administration. The faction fight among the administration was reflected among the prisoners. We discovered that the leadership in the prison was not unlike that in the dormitory in its function. In other words a leadership was oriented to the values of the people at the top and committed to making the system work. Coleman, by ignoring this aspect of peer group organization can leave a very erroneous impression.

Now a couple of further items on the Alabama study. Understanding of the social arrangements in the dormitory came only after several months' work. At one point the researcher reported that there was no system of orderly relation. Then, when she began to work through her own materials the separate facts began to fall into a consistent pattern and after a while she wondered how it was that she had been unable to see what was now so clear. In fact, she got to the point where she was able to predict who was going to do what, when, with whom, and how others were going to respond.

The point that I'm trying to make here is that the exploratory nature of the natural history method is one which continuously seeks relationships and you build analysis upon analysis. Although you are utilizing hunches, assumptions, and hypotheses, all the time you are also rejecting these as new data direct you toward new understanding of that which you are attempting to examine. This is not a pure inductive system by any means. There is no such thing as a pure inductive system. But it is much more of an inductive system than is that utilized by the physical sciences, which first formulate hypotheses or models before research is initiated.

Now the relationship of the approach and findings to guidance work seems to

me to be fairly clear without further specifications. But let me tell you about some other kinds of problems, where we are woefully lacking in knowledge. As a matter of fact, that which needs to be known is probably 95% ahead of us rather than 20 or 40 or 50 % behind us. We have a study going on now that I hope will be published within the next two years -- in a small high school in Illinois. In one sense, this is a pilot study for the purpose of attempting to improve some of the rather crude field techniques which we use and of enabling us to make some more specific formulations about the nature of group inclusion and group exclusion, not only in terms of clique formation but in relation to those who are outside the clique system. We still lack a working typology of cliques. The first steps were taken by Hollingshead in Elmtown's Youth and another study by Wayne Gordon has advanced our knowledge some, but we still don't know the total informal pattern of any high school. We want also to see the relationship between the nature of the cliques in the informal system and academic performance; is there a relationship between these variables?

When this study is completed -- and I'm sorry that Dr. Chandler had to leave -- I would like to ask NIMH or some other agency, I don't care which, for support for a large scale study. It would take about \$300,000 and about five years to do the kind of job that ought to be done by making a sampling of different kinds of high schools in the United States, utilizing our improved techniques for examination of a total system of high school clique formation in relationship to the administrative structure, and in relationship to the academic program of that kind of system. We do not exclude sampling and empirical validity, Dr. McCully, for those kinds of problems where the results are germane to and support a research rather than being the main objective of a study. It seems to me that out of such a study will come, for example, a clearing away of many unknowns for people who are in guidance, in that they will

then have at their command some kind of systemic knowledge of the nature of the informal structure system that students live in.

What is the relation of this to learning? The title of my formal paper, if you will recall, is The Relation of Learning to Social Organization. Well, we are on our way to understanding at least some aspects of the relation of the peer group system to the learning processes. But I believe that the most significant contribution is on a theoretical and methodological level. The natural history approach is a system operating on certain principles -- the principles of taxonomy, the principles of seeking relationships, the principles of trying to work out patterns -- it is essentially the intellectual process used by great minds of the Western World to solve many of their difficult problems. This kind of learning process, theoretically, can be introduced into the school system; through it students can learn to discover for themselves rather than having the information that other people have already discovered thrown at them to memorize. This relates to a protest I have about our present use of the word "creativity". This process would keep the student constantly involved in creativity in terms of his own comprehension and building of patterns and understandings on the cognitive level of behavior.

I have about eight more minutes and I must say something about the other part of my paper, which had to do with organization of the educational system and, by implication at least, with the place of the guidance person in it. You will recall that in the early part of my paper I described contemporary society in terms of a particular kind of social group or social structure. In the volume Education and New America by Jim McClellan and myself this is described in considerable detail and the modern world is contrasted with agrarian society of the past. In essence, we make a distinction between what is called the public world and the private world. The private world is composed of family and friends. The public world constitutes, in America now, the great corporate structures of

3

government, of industry, of health, of education, of religion, etc. These great corporate structures were in their emergent form in the 1890s but in effect, came into existence at the end of the First World War. They have developed into ever greater organized systems, which are ever more separate from the private world.

The point I made, in my paper, was that the school forms the transitional system by which a person is moved from his private world to the public world through the transmission of that kind of knowledge and skills which make it possible for him then to assume his place in the public world. The people whom we fail, both literally and in the moral sense in our society, are the people who are in our slums, for whom our school system does not fulfill this function. That is, there is no place for the slum child, or for any child, for that matter, who is forced to leave the school system before he has acquired both the kinds of skills and the operation of the kind of mentality with which he can perceive and take for himself some significant place in the larger structure.

The point that I was making, among other things, was that the organization of these larger corporate structures is hierarchial and bureaucratic. Educators had to go someplace to get an organizational form which would solve the problem of the tremendously expanded number of people to be served by the school systems of an urban world, when this replaced the one-room school system of the 1880s, which educated most of our children at that time. I suggested that the organizational form which came in was one which was taken over from a municipal department (that is, a form of bureaucratic structure), and that this organizational form was a hierarchy of directional flow from concentrated authority at the top to the student at the bottom. This is the structure which organizes kindergarten, grade school, and high school.

My other point was that the supervisory relationship, which is apt to obtain when the student is at the bottom, does not entail any necessary learning whatever. The person who employs and tells someone to do something on the job

assumes that the man knows how to do it, and if he does not do it, he gives him a little instruction once, and if he can't learn, then they fire him or they do something else with him. The supervisory relationship is vastly different from the teacher-learner relationship, and if the supervisory relationship gets entirely taken over into our school systems, then the teaching-learning process is inhibited or corrupted and it is not possible to teach.

What we must do is to have a structural system for education which is not the counterpart of the structural system of an industrial corporation. When Mr. McCully read my paper and made comments on it, he made this comment: "We are sure it was not intended by the writer, but the inference might be drawn that not only the educational structure but the incumbents of positions at the apex of the educational hierarchy also, individually and as a corporate group, have shown no movement in their thinking or behavior since 1900, or that as one wag has put it, administrators are concerned with staying in the saddle rather than with the direction in which the horse is moving." Unfortunately, it is my inference and it was intended.

The glacial movement of the educational hierarchy is of a kind which, as near as I can observe it, is actively furthering rigidity and, with some few exceptions those who are active in educational administration have not even moved as far as the organizational prototypes from which they drew their original inspiration. In a footnote of the paper, for example, I referred to a report from NEA regarding a new program, and I quote, "To help big city teachers solve problems of their own in the urban areas they serve." The man who prepared this program and is directing it is a man who was the head of a department of administration at Teachers College. There was no mention at all that any of the problems which teachers face in the big city school systems have to do with the way the administration of that school is operating.

You may gather that I have certain feelings about the nature of the administrative structure. Any such conclusion is quite right. The administrative structure should work; it should work well. Its occupants should perform the job for which they have assumed responsibility. It so happens that in the area of research in organizations we now have information available about organizational structures which makes so clear the difference between the kind of organization which is a mechanical type, such as that of the police force of New York City, or an entirely different type. It is also probable that the greatest changes in the organizational form are now going on in, of all places, the Pentagon. Although there are hues and cries and haulings and pullings and the old mechanical structure of line organization is bucking as hard as it can, the new structure of military organization is being built around problems and not around status. It is being built around solution of missile systems, around solving logistical problems, around the operating problems of an agency given the responsibility of utilizing the intelligence and the technological capacity of our society in military operations. The old system which demanded only that a soldier put the gun to his shoulder and pull the trigger no longer has any meaning.

Educators should also begin to look at their educational system in terms of its reformation. Now what has this got to do with guidance workers? It's got an awful lot to do with guidance workers because if you are in an educational bureaucracy in which a mechanical line organization operates, then, first of all, many of the problems which you have will be consequence of the very operation of that kind of a system. The kind of organizational environment in which guidance can operate best is not one which runs from colonels to sergeants, with guidance workers as sergeants. It's one in which there are types of problems which need to be solved in terms of the functioning of a system. Therefore, you are vitally interested, or you should be vitally interested, in the nature of the

organizational environment in which you operate.

May I take one last minute, two minutes, to just throw out a teaser here? One of the things that is not in my paper that Esther Westervelt did her best to get in and Esther Lloyd-Jones also wanted in very badly was a page or two on rites of passage. Within anthropology we have known for a long time and have worked with the concept that people move from one status to another in the progression of life. This status begins at birth; you move through a childhood period, from being an infant to being a child, from being a child into adolescence, then into post-adolescence, young adulthood and so forth and so on. Depending upon the nature of the criticalness of that movement, societies around the world have ceremonies which serve the purpose of making public the nature of the transition as well as easing the individual through the transitional stage.

It would be quite interesting to carry on research in modern, contemporary society in which we took the critical periods that Jerry Kagan was talking about and studied what relation these would have to these other kinds of critical periods, marked by rites of passage. Now, what are these latter critical periods? They are those in which there are significant changes in the persons with whom you associate, or they are critical periods because there is a change in the kind of emotional and cognitive behavior that is expected of you or they represent both these changes. And so we have in primitive societies -- not all primitive societies, by the way, and this is interesting and complex -- puberty ceremonies at the point at which a person leaves behind his childhood and enters into the first stages of adulthood. He isn't a full adult. But often the puberty ceremony is at the point at which the girl, for example, is available for marriage, or the boy has certain religious knowledge and certain kinds of technical skills available to him that were not available to him before.

There is appearing in the next issue of Human Organization, which is the journal of the Society for Applied Anthropology, an article that I wrote for the

Social Science Research Council some five years ago which views much of education as a rite of passage. In it I talk about a whole series of potential research possibilities in the educational field, such as viewing the college experience as the point at which an individual is really removed from his private world of high school peers and family and moved into another kind of institutional world in preparation for his full participation in the larger society. This may be of interest to you because here you will get a specification of a dozen or so types of research projects of which some, I am very certain, will be of interest and value to people in the guidance area.

DISCUSSION

C. Hirning: The natural history method as described by Solon is very close to psychiatry. I think here we have the possibility for research in counseling, if guidance counselors can see this method of approach as against some of the sociological techniques like Coleman's. The guidance counselor can be a participant observer par excellence, and in being a participant observer, he is not violating his role as a guidance counselor, he is not doing something else from what he would be doing anyhow. In high school and in junior high school, incidentally, the only effective participant observer I can think of would be the guidance counselor, if he is successful in getting close to the youngsters, in getting the kind of data from them that they might not reveal to anybody else. I have often talked with groups of teachers on the problem of who is the peer group leader in the classroom. Of course, teachers have no idea at all. They think it's the kid who carries the flag or the kid who gets good marks or sometimes they think it's the kid who makes the most trouble. They don't realize that it's the youngster in the corner for whom the other one is getting in trouble in order to gain his approval. He may be the peer group leader, and what he says determines the success or failure of the teacher's academic efforts.

S. Kimball: But they don't have to do it alone, you see. They can enlist interested and able teachers and students to work with them, in the relationship of people working together on a problem.

Question: Why did you make the assumption that this focal person that you're talking about in this teenage study was the real leader?

S. Kimball: There were two or three examples in which the floor as a whole operated as a social unit. And in these events, without anybody electing anybody, they always turned to her and she was the one who naturally and normally took over, saying, "Well it should be done this way or that way." She wasn't really a director, in a sense, but she was one when the whole group wanted direction.

Question: She wasn't a part of a particular group?

S. Kimball: No.

Question: You're saying this is not based on the fact that they took personal problems to her but that she was an influence in these decision making processes?

S. Kimball: That's right.

Comment: I wanted to point out that Solon's remarks on the study of organizational structure in educational administration are very helpful. I can't think of anything which is more profound than that in relation to studying really what is happening to kids. I think a study of this kind can show us the lag between ideal cultural patterns and reality patterns. In doing that I think we might find out if there are any ideal patterns with regard to organizational administration.

S. Kimball: First of all, I need to and must qualify that somewhat forceful overstatement that I made. The kind of thing which I describe is very evident in the big city schools. In many of the suburban schools you see excellent

administration, full participation. You see grade A extraordinary administration practiced by the people who are the superintendents and principals and so on. There is a difference between the core city and the suburban areas. As to the ideal pattern: when Cubberley wrote and was the leading person in the area of educational administration, he drew his models from the corporate system. He talked about this explicitly. I haven't been able to find out for certain how long ago this system had begun to decline -- at least by 1930. They were beginning to question Cubberley by this time. As McCully points out, there has been a lot of stirring and looking around since then, for what might be done. At the moment, I think, if you went into a class or a program where educational administration is taught, you'd discover that they aren't nearly as dogmatic as they used to be. They are far more uncertain; but I don't think they have evolved yet anything for sure that they think is really the way to do it. They still are faced with certain types of bureaucratic problems that obviously need to be solved bureaucratically---ways to make sure the water runs, make sure the floors are swept, things of this nature. But they haven't really addressed themselves, as I understand it, to the problem of the relationship between a school administrative system, a formal system of students, and the whole problem of the school fulfilling its function within the system I've talked about.

Comment: Solon, I'm interested in the general contribution that anthropological method can give us to understanding some of the significant processes in guidance particularly, for example, the process of freedom-acquisition. It does seem to me that you have a unique opportunity to cast a great deal of light on this from the point of view of cultures which are acquiring freedom; perhaps the most examples are the African nations which are going through a process of acquiring self-determination. I want to ask if you can see anything in what anthropologists are doing which would help us understand this process on a cultural level. For example, the anthropologists who worked on the Vicos Indians in Peru are absolutely convinced that the process of change has to be a very slow one -- that people have to learn how to act differently with one another. These Indians who had never operated within the form of a council had to learn how to operate in the form of a council -- I've forgotten the date, but it was at the end of five years, I think, that they first gave to the council its full autonomy. They sat there quivering, wondering whether that council would explode. It didn't explode because they had been learning the processes by which people make responsible decisions in terms of understanding the situation. The problem of freedom and responsibility we talked about yesterday from the point of view of the individual, I would talk about in terms of having those structures that make it possible for people to operate responsibly and with some autonomy.

Question: Do you include in your analysis the relationship between structure and content?

S. Kimball: It is out of the comparative analysis of different social cultural systems, personality systems, and structural systems, one with another, that you begin to see the nature of the interrelations between them.

Question: What degree of influence does exist reciprocally between the content of culture and the structures that tend to evolve?

S. Kimball: They are deeply interdependent.

E. Lloyd-Jones: Solon, as you've been presenting these various thought provoking ideas - thought provoking certainly to me, maybe it's because of the way I think

- I've kept posing your ideas against some great big problems. A number of people who, I think, know American education in a very sound way, are saying, and have been saying, that urban high schools and particularly cultural underprivileged youngsters of whom we have a larger and larger number in larger and larger proportion, are the greatest challenge that confront education today. We don't know how to deal with them. Education, even civilization, in this country can kind of break down because we are doing such a poor job at these points. Lester Nelson, who I think is a very wise man about education, has said to me this fall in our talks, that he doesn't think administration is going to be able to do one thing about this problem. Administration is so concerned and has to be so concerned with exploding populations, with just getting the building and the teachers, and keeping the floor swept; he doesn't see administration, as he goes around the country, tackling this problem in any way that is going to be effective.

The Ford people brought curriculum leaders together for three weeks this last summer and Lester thinks they did some interesting things, but he doesn't think that curriculum people or scholars in particular fields, as he sees them operating, are going to tackle this. And then he said something that really just scared me to death. "I do see some evidence, in some few places, of sparks of interest and imagination in guidance people. They may be able to do something about this problem."

I think that Jerry, in what he has to say about role models, describes the problems that we are up against. I don't think these culturally different kids are going to enjoy sitting with us for an hour or even a half an hour in verbal interchange very often. I think we must do something quite different in helping them to discover their own potentialities and the world around them. I have a notion, out of some of the things that we were thinking about yesterday, that we are too committed to the role that we attempt to maintain. If we can crack this role a little bit and become problem-centered in terms of role, and in terms of organization, and in terms of reaching out for new material, it seems to me that here lie great and fascinating opportunities.

S. Kimball: Our colleague Hal Clark at Columbia made the point that those institutional aspects of America that show the greatest advance have been those which have had the greatest amount of research money available to them. Education is at the very bottom in terms of the amount of money available. Research is no panacea, obviously, but it does reflect the fact that people are interested in how things operate and ideas.

Comment: Could I make a brief comment, Dr. Kimball, about a university where the president wanted the guidance and counseling man, who is to be in charge of the counseling function, to have at least dean status and to be responsible to the president. He was given the assignment to fight the social system as vigorously tooth-and-nail as he possibly could in so far as it tended to crush individual students. And then, of course, the president assigned the other members, professors, and other deans, to get the last ounce of conformity that they could out of the students.

S. Kimball: I wisely transfer your question to Hal Cowley.

W. Brookover: I have two comments: I could not sit quietly and leave what I think is the impression, it may have been made by Sol, that the sociological methods, as represented by Jim Coleman, and anthropological methods are distinctly different in all respects and never the twain shall meet. For example, my colleagues in the office and I are in the process of studying participant

observation methods in the social system of eight elementary schools with particular emphasis on the teachers' social system, which I think has never been done. However, whether this is anthropology or sociology, I really don't know.

S. Kimball: Wilbur, I've been waiting for you to make just that comment. I'm glad you did, because the person who has done the most in the area of research in education is a sociologist of the anthropological type, Everett Hughes.

W. Brookover: One other comment. It seems to me that yesterday there was the danger of the possibility of furthering the concept of social structure, society, and individual personality as separate kinds of things. Some of the emotion yesterday that came out in Jerry Kagan's operation was a reflection of this. The social structure that you are talking about is a significant part of the personality development and learning of the child.

FURTHER QUESTIONS FROM THE SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

To what degree is the natural history method concerned with

- a) the problem of reliability?
- b) the problem of selecting and preparing the participant observer?

The discontinuities in our culture (between home and school, between school and industry, between adolescence and adulthood, etc.) appear to us to be increasing. Research on these discontinuities appears to us to be vitally important.

If the counselor is a participant observer, what do you as an anthropologist see him doing?

Are there not differences in the importance of rites of passages in democratic societies as distinct from the importance of such rites in autocratic societies?

How can the following be rationalized?

- 1) One has no right to use information to control individuals without their (the individuals') knowledge.
- 2) The individual can perceive only that which he has learned to perceive.

What does one do if the individuals to be controlled cannot perceive the information used to control them?

A TENTATIVE HOLISTIC TAXONOMY APPLIED TO EDUCATION

W. H. Cowley

I'll try to do in an hour what takes me forty at home in my basic course. I'll use last April's paper, which is a bare outline, as a basis to expand upon.

May I begin, however, by answering a question that no one has asked here but which has been many times elsewhere: "What is a Professor of Higher Education?" I'll answer historically by pointing out that President G. Stanley Hall taught the first course in Higher Education in this country in 1893 at Clark University. One evening a week he invited interested graduate students from all six departments (and Clark in those days had only six departments) to his house to talk about the institutions in which they'd spend their lives. One of the people in that seminar was Lewis Terman, later to win great eminence at Stanford; and there were many others who later became important. I understand that President Eliot at Harvard also had such a seminar, but I have been unable to learn much about it. I do know, however, that W.T. Foster, an economist and the first president of Reed College, took it. Foster in turn taught the first course in Higher Education at Teachers College in the summer of 1909 along with E. E. Brown, then United States Commissioner of Education and later Chancellor of New York University.

The first professorship of the subject emerged at Johns Hopkins about 1915. A man named Edward F. Buchner held it. There are now about a hundred professors of higher education over the country, most of them not of high quality. About fifteen institutions have fairly substantial programs in the subject, but in my judgment none is substantial enough. In any event, back in 1928 Stanford created a professorship devoted essentially to the junior college. Walter Crosby Eels held it. He later became Executive Secretary of the National Junior College Association. He was succeeded by Al Eurich, now of the Ford Foundation, and I succeeded Eurich in 1945.

Before then I had not taught the subject and, in fact, had never had a course in Education. I had been attached for nine years to the Bureau of Educational

Research at Ohio State, but I didn't teach. I was a research man and administrative handyman. My degree was in psychology in a rather restricted field, psycho-physics, with a statistical emphasis. At Ohio State I headed the Personnel Division of the Bureau and did research in the student services area. Incidentally, Ralph Tyler was the head of the comparable Division of Educational Tests. We arrived there the same day and left the same day.

Most of my time at Ohio State -- this is relevant to what I do at Stanford and what I'll say today -- I wasn't able to do much research because it was discovered early that I had administrative ability. And so for nine years I was operating all over the campus out of the President's Office (although not officially attached to it) as a trouble shooter. Let me illustrate. In 1929 when I arrived I was given two assignments, and one of them resulted from a murder. Some months earlier a professor of veterinary medicine had murdered a graduate student -- a woman medical student -- and was electrocuted for the crime -- or were they still hanging in Ohio? His Dean had known about the love affair of the professor and the student, and so he was dismissed. They appointed a new Dean -- the Professor of Large Animal Surgery. He knew nothing about administration, and so I was sent over by the President's Office to reorganize the College of Veterinary Medicine (this is the only time, by the way, that I'll bring sex into my talk) and to get him established as an administrator.

My second utility job that first year was to keep the freshmen football players eligible so that they'd become at least sophomores. That was in my own field, student affairs. There were only seven sophomores available that fall for the Ohio State football team. Clearly not enough, particularly for the capital of football in the United States -- Columbus, Ohio. Without telling you how I did it (and it was all done honorably), I can report that there were 52 sophomores available the next fall. These are just examples of several dozen such assignments. When the Health Service had to be reorganized, I did it; when NYA came along with

\$200,000 budgeted to Ohio State, I administered it, etc. I got all over the campus.

I arrived at Stanford after six years as a college president in which post I also was all over the campus because a small college president does everything. And I faced a problem: without having had any education courses and with this type of background, what should I do at Stanford? I inherited a series of courses that my predecessor Al Eurich had taught. One was in curriculum, another was in administration, another was in student personnel services, etc. For two or three years I taught his courses, but it soon became clear to me that this wasn't the way -- for me at least -- to do it.

With my kind of background I was concerned with the overview of all of the facets of higher education because I'd done student personnel services, I'd been involved in attempting to build up the educational program of a college, and I'd been involved in all sorts of administrative problems. So I had a peculiarly wide-ranging, not necessarily deep, but wide-ranging knowledge of colleges and universities. It was quite obvious to me that each one of the areas would require a full-time person to know it thoroughly, and that wasn't in the cards. Therefore, I have attempted to see the whole range of higher education. The result of these years has been the evolution of the taxonomy outlined in the paper I read in Chicago last April and which has been reproduced for this conference.

May I say in further introduction that this attempt to see the whole is a very egotistical and dangerous thing to do because I invade everybody else's field. Therefore, I expect to be attacked as a buttinsky who is butting in without sufficient knowledge. I'm prepared for that; somebody has to do this and put up with the slings and arrows of outraged -- and also outrageous -- specialists.

What I'd like to do today is to go through the fifteen taxons discussed in my paper, expand upon them, and then raise some general questions at the end before you come in. If you have the two-page outline in front of you, it would be helpful. Notice that I have what I call two axial taxons, Structure and Function. Now a structure to me is a unit, and differs from the taxon called structuring which is

the internal organization of that unit. We've done fourteen research dissertations at Stanford just on structuring as distinct from structure because the most important problem that faced American education (not just higher education) in the nineteenth century was how it was to be structured.

I'll give an example or two to elucidate. The first one was in 1852 when Michigan inaugurated its first president. It had gone for seventeen years without one. He was Henry Philip Tappan who was enamored of the German organization of education and introduced the notion that the American four-year college was an anomaly and should be destroyed. He attempted to destroy it by pushing back the first two years of the historic college into the secondary schools and beginning the college, as in Germany, at the end of the traditional sophomore year. We're still living with this notion, as the debates indicate. I wrote an article about it in 1942 when Mr. Hutchins moved in this direction in the University of Chicago. I predicted in that article that the effort would fail, and it did fail in 1955 as had all other attempts to do this, which I reviewed in my article. But the idea is not dead yet; in fact, the Ford Foundation is vigorously attempting to resuscitate it. This is an example of a great structural problem.

The second example is the development of comprehensive universities which resulted largely from the Land Grant College Act of 1862 and which changed our whole pattern of education from that of Europe. European higher education historically admitted only the four faculties of the medieval university: medicine, theology, law, and philosophy or knowledge in general. It did not admit engineering; it did not admit agriculture; it did not admit the ancillary medical sciences, etc. All of these remained outside the structure of higher education. We, in America, because of our egalitarian predilections, have developed the comprehensive university. This development was reinforced by the reorganization of Harvard in 1890, the most influential reorganization of any institution that this country has ever seen because it established the graduate school over the undergraduate college.

So much for the distinction between the structure and structuring taxons. Consider now the taxon of function. With the help of my students I've made a study of the concept of function in other fields -- in linguistics, psychology, anthropology, biology, sociology, etc. -- and have found that they have differing notions about it. None of their concepts, moreover, quite fit the problem, it seems to me, of employing the concept in studying social institutions or structures; and this had led to my defining a function as a characteristic activity of a structure. It has also led to the making of a clear distinction between a function and a purpose. A function is an activity, a purpose is an intention to engage in an activity. I point out to my students that a purpose is always expressed by means of an infinitive (to walk, to play), and a function as a gerund (walking, playing).

To understand the vast array of characteristic activities or functions of colleges and universities, a sub-taxonomy is needed. You'll note in the outline that I've proposed one and have categorized the functions of higher educational institutions under three headings: core, complementary, and continuity. As I see it, colleges and universities have only two core functions: teaching and research. Teaching, of course, is formal and informal, which greatly differ in higher education at least. About fifty years ago writers about elementary education included everything under the curriculum that was experienced by the child in the school. They called that the curriculum. I don't know why they didn't distinguish between formal and informal education, but they have ever since lumped everything in the curriculum. This conception has no status whatever in higher education where the nature of the curriculum is quite clear. That for which you get credit toward the degree or certificate is called the curriculum. Everything else is extracurriculum. There's a good deal of teaching that goes on in the extracurriculum, but it's informal. There's no credit for it, and so I would want to make clear that when I talk about teaching, I'm also talking about the informal teaching that goes on in the

two divisions of the extracurriculum. We have the structured extracurriculum (fraternities, clubs, societies, or whatnot) and the unstructured extracurriculum made up of the infinitely important incidental relationships that develop on the campus.

Research is a relatively new function. We gave it little recognition in this country until the opening of Johns Hopkins in 1876. There had been some incidental research, but it was done by professors on their own. For example, the first real research man we had in this country was a science professor at Harvard -- Isaac Greenwood. He was a Professor of Natural Philosophy. He was dismissed because he brought back from Europe three pairs of silk stockings, and he was a bachelor. He was also inebriated a good deal of time -- our first research man liked alcohol and women.

Thus, we have a history of individual research on the part of professors but no recognition of research as an institutional function until 1876. Of course, the history of conceptual research goes all the way back to the Middle Ages and dominated Oxford in its first centuries. Factual research, in the sense of getting the facts to support concepts, is new all over the world since the Renaissance, and it's new in this country since about 1876.

These, then, are the core functions -- teaching and research. They are the characteristic activities which institutions of higher education have been established to perform. The second group of functions I call "complementary" -- activities engaged in to enhance the core functions. Counseling is one of these. Higher education has not been established to counsel students. Counseling is complementary to teaching. We have other agencies in which counseling is a core function, but in schools and colleges it is not a core function. Some of you may disagree with me about this, and we can discuss the question later.

Selecting students for admission is, of course, incidental, complementary. We've got to get students in, just as we have to have devices for getting them out.

The latter is in some ways less important than it used to be, since we no longer have the professional diploma privilege, which probably most of you don't know about; and so let me describe it briefly. In 1900 sixteen states of the Union permitted lawyers to practice law with a diploma only; no state bar examination was required. Similarly, when William James took his M.D. in 1867, Harvard had the diploma privilege in medicine; and so when he passed nine oral examinations, each of which took five minutes, he became an M.D. and a licensed practitioner at the same time. The diploma privilege has all but disappeared in this country, and the selection function for the performance of a profession is now in the hands of the state. Colleges and universities, however, determine who gets the degrees which is a major avenue to taking bar examinations, etc. I think there are only one or two percent of people taking bar examinations that haven't gone through law school and don't have the L.L.B. The selection of who gets out is, therefore, still very important.

I have identified about a dozen complementary functions, but I've listed only a few in my paper. One of these is providing forums for the statement of public policy. For example, the Marshall Plan was announced at a Harvard commencement; Winston Churchill proposed a change of policy toward Russia in his famous "Iron Curtain" speech at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri; Eisenhower, after a long delay, came out against McCarthy at a Dartmouth commencement, etc.

The forum function is now, incidentally, very controversial on many campuses, including Stanford. Who can use this forum function? What speakers will be invited? Ohio State is also having much difficulty here. Its whole faculty met last April. Of 3,000 members, 2,200 turned up to vote on the issue. A good deal of research needs to be done on the forum function. I've needed the help of some one well informed on this subject in the writing of a book I hope soon to finish, but I haven't been able to find anyone. Apparently no one has done any research on it as yet.

The honorific function is, of course, very important in the United States since we don't have a Queen's list or a King's list or an Honors list by means of which people can be given public recognition. We have, therefore, from the very beginning given honorary degrees. The first honorary degree given in this country, I believe, was to George Washington by Harvard (an L.L.D.) as he took command of the Continental Army.

This honorific function creates difficult problems, particularly with the clergy. In England the D.D. is an earned degree. A clergyman earns it not by taking courses but by presenting a dissertation eight or ten years after he graduates from the university which then decides whether he's worth a D.D. Here one doesn't have to earn it through scholarship. It's honorary, and clerical alumni want the degree -- in part at least -- because of its status value. Some institutions, like Cornell, the University of Chicago, and Stanford have said they will give no honorary degrees. Chicago had to abandon that stand because soon after the University was established in 1892 the great Columbia World's Fair at its doorstep brought sixty distinguished German professors to Chicago to read learned papers. Well, should these people receive honorary degrees or not? Chicago turned them down; but when President McKinley later visited the campus, they couldn't turn him down. Stanford gives one a year, I think, in an attempt to break away from the troublesome honorary degree "racket." I could expand on this, but I'm sure you understand what this function is.

Another complementary function is the haven function which serves both students and faculty. An institution of higher education is a haven for the kinds of people who, in the judgment of the institutions, have important functions to perform and thus need to be supported -- Einstein at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, for example. I think Stanford performs a haven function for me because certainly the fees that students pay for my courses don't cover my salary. For students the haven function is particularly dramatic now because of

the draft; and it is also very important as a function of secondary schools because our economy cannot at present absorb young adolescent workers. The universities and colleges do the same thing, but to a lesser degree because they're much more selective -- although not so highly selective, as a whole, as European universities. In any event, this is the haven function. I won't enlarge upon the other complementary functions, but they may come up in the discussion.

I call the next sub-taxon the Continuity Function. You will notice that I don't use the term "administration" because administration is, in my judgment, a continuity function, and I break down the operations within it rather than talk about administration as a whole. Administration exists to facilitate, to develop, and superintend the core and complementary functions.

I mentioned that I'm finishing a book. It's to be entitled Professors, Presidents, and Trustees, and it describes and criticizes American academic government. Government includes administration. Thus here I use the term government in the sense that we use it in civil government to embrace executive, legislative, and judicial functions. Higher educational institutions engage in all three of these kinds of activities. Many faculty committees, for example, primarily perform judicial functions. I served on one last year -- the committee that decides who gets appointed and who gets promoted. This committee performs a function of considerable consequence for the future of an institution, and its work is essentially judicial, not administrative.

The executive function spreads out widely and includes superintendence or control, facilitation, and development. Many faculty members believe that the function of administration is only facilitation: "You get us the chalk and the books and other things that we need and get our paychecks out on time, and that's all we want of administration. Leadership is ours, determination of policy is ours." This belief is absolutely fallacious historically and also thoroughly undesirable. Some of you may be interested in why I think this, but that may come

out later. In any event, continuity functions are those an institution performs in order to continue in existence and not for their own sake. Each of these, of course, has breakdowns.

Now I call Structure and Function axial taxons because they are the axes around which everything else turns. I move on now to discuss the "everything else." They are included, I believe, in the thirteen other taxons; and I begin by commenting on the two Generator Taxons, the sources of power of a structure. First there are Purposes. Now this is a most complicated business. Whose purpose? When you deal with a social institution, you have within it the purposes of every individual involved in the institution plus groups, sub-groups, cliques, etc.

How then do you determine purpose? I long ago came to the conclusion that any statement of purpose from any institution is likely to be fairly useless because it's merely the least common denominator upon which agreement can be reached and that therefore little can be accomplished by assessing statements of purpose. You have to get at purposes indirectly by means of functions. What do institutions do? Behind the answer to this question lie purposes and behind purposes, values.

I define values as the desirable, the good, and the worthy. I've been looking for many years for where Plato talked about the good, the true, and the beautiful; and I can't find that he ever said it. I have found the Lewis Carroll use of the triad, however, and maybe, Mr. Ginascol, with your knowledge of Plato you can direct me to the original. In any event, I define values as the desirable, the good, and the worthy. Now, of course, what you value as the desirable, good, and worthy I might think undesirable, bad, or unworthy. Such differences, such conflicts of values result in conflicts of purposes which in turn result in confusion of functions, etc. I'll leave this complex taxon to discussion after the end of this talk.

I move on, therefore, to the four Operational Taxons, the first of which is Personas. Notice that it is broken down into personnels, clienteles, and external individuals and groups. Notice also that I don't use the term student personnel

any more because I believe it an incorrect designation. Personnel means employees, and students are not employees. Colleges and universities have many varieties of personnels. I have been able to identify at least fifteen types of personnel that function in colleges and universities. They range from full professors to assistant janitors and fall into two large categories -- academic and non-academic. Colleges and universities also serve at least a dozen varieties of clienteles. We have resident students, and we have extension students. We have part-time extension students, and we have part-time resident students. We also have incidental clientele -- people who attend lecture series or attend church services or football games. The last named constitutes a clientele because, like it or not, furnishing entertainment has become a function of American higher education.

This reminds me that I must go back to the complementary functions because of something that Sol Kimball said this morning. He talked about what I call the ceremonial function. An important illustration is commencement when the professors put on black robes and colorful hoods which nobody understands or knows where they came from or why. The more garishly you can get yourself up, incidentally, the more distinguished you look. If you can possibly get a red robe, then you really have arrived. Well, this function is very important in my judgment because ceremony is the cement that holds social institutions together. In colleges and universities we don't, I think, have enough ceremony. I'm talking particularly about student ceremonies. Mr. Kimball this morning mentioned rites of passage. We have too few of them in our society. Of course, hazing, which is now happily on its way out, is a type of rite of passage; and the more sophisticated fraternities at least have brought it to a higher level. In any case, hazing and other initiation ceremonies are rites of passage, ceremonial functions. A good deal of research could be done on the ceremonies necessary to make student life healthy.

The Persona Taxon includes external individuals and groups. I'm particularly interested in these at the moment because in the book I'm working on I discuss the

effects of external academic bodies on educational policy. I'm now moving into the section that has to do, for example, with the influence of the American Psychological Association upon the psychological curriculum of the colleges in the country, and so on through all the disciplines. My point is that much of the discussion about departments as the ultimate units in the determination of their curricula is misleading. The ultimate units are external to the university and are organized disciplines or so-called learned societies. Riesman has called them "veto groups." Thus when people talk about tyrannical presidents and tyrannical boards of trustees, they're naive because what's taught in psychology is determined by the central tendency, the consensus of the discipline as a whole, not by presidents, trustees, deans, or even departments.

There are other kinds of external bodies, usually called pressure groups, such as, on occasion, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, the people in the neighborhood, religious bodies, all sorts of groups that affect policy. What about alumni? They are really a special academic body. I take the position, which some of you will probably debate, that by and large alumni influence has been good despite much publicity to the contrary. The newspapers and magazines, of course, sustain themselves by publishing the negative because it's dramatic; seldom the undramatic positive. By and large, the contribution of alumni to American higher education has been fabulously good. I'll develop this if any of you care to have me.

Next under Operational Taxons is the Resources Taxon: plant, equipment, funds, etc. In my Chicago paper I didn't make a clear distinction between the tangible and the intangible. The intangible resources of good will, etc. need to be accounted for and are accounted for in my courses. I have developed a triad of subjective, objective, and projective factors which relate to this; but I shall pass it over here because of its complexity. I do want to make the point, however, that intangible as well as tangible resources must be taken into account.

Next is the Structuring Taxon, the internal organization of the structure under study. There is a structuring of the system of higher education which must be accounted for as well as the internal structure of an institution as such. We have a very large number of institutions in the American system of higher education although many fewer, incidentally, than is generally assumed. People talk about 2000 institutions, but they're wrong. We have about 1300 degree granting institutions and about 300 respectable junior colleges (I say respectable in terms of recognition as such by the American Association of Junior Colleges, that is, accredited). In other words, we have about 1600 institutions that some accrediting body says are respectable and about 400 that are not.

In any case, each of these units has its own internal structuring. You get some central tendencies here, but all structuring involves networks of status and power, concepts which require considerable discussion. Harvard, for example, is structured much differently than Stanford. The description of the structuring of an institution, that is, the interrelationship of its personnel, operational administrators of various units is extremely complicated.

Let us move to the next set of taxons, the Control Taxons. Maybe you'll recall that my paper included a whole page in which I discussed the fact that control is involved in every taxon. Early in the paper I used the analogy of a snake which, touched at one spot, wiggles all over. That's true about the control functions; it's also true about all the other functions. Any taxonomy is an abstraction, employed to break down a complex entity into its elements; but in looking at the elements you must not forget that each is interrelated with all other elements. In any event, I introduced government as a control factor, and I mean not only civil government but also internal controls. Government is the making of policy, you might say, and administration is the carrying out of policy.

In the United States we have so-called private institutions, a term that I rarely use, however, because all institutions are public. I distinguish between

two types of private institutions by means of a terminology that I know you won't like. I don't like it myself. I call all institutions that have no state or church connections alodial, a term which comes from a medieval law. An alodium was a freehold, and some American colleges and universities are freehold institutions -- Harvard, Yale, Stanford, etc. The other term is fautorial, a French word meaning partisan. I use this for institutions related to some special interest group, such as religious denominations.

All colleges and universities are publicly created and publicly accountable. Even Harvard is accountable to the state of Massachusetts. In fact in 1924 an alumnus of Harvard attempted to get through the legislature of Massachusetts (it's still called the General Court) a revision of Harvard's fundamental government. He didn't succeed, but he might well have. The time may come when public opinion in Massachusetts is so much against Harvard that the state will take over or change the Harvard pattern. In fact, in the Massachusetts constitution, in operation since 1790, it's clearly stated that nothing therein about the University shall be construed to prohibit the state government from revising the Harvard government as it cares to.

All American colleges and universities are creatures of the state and subject to various controls of the state. Many faculty members forget this. They also seem to forget that we essentially exist in the public interest.

Environmental Controls, of course, speak for themselves. Internal and external environmental controls, both natural and cultural, regulate functioning. I discussed these considerations in the paper probably enough for our purposes.

The Control Taxons also include Historical Continua. Esther Lloyd-Jones referred to me the other day as an historian, but I always object to this because I don't think of myself as such. Yet I do a lot of historical work for the reason that I long ago discovered that people use history as a weapon to support their points of view. Take the book I'm working on, for example. I'm sure you have all

heard many times that boards of trustees are American inventions created by businessmen in order to control colleges and universities. Well, this isn't so. The concept of boards of trustees began in Italy in the fifteenth century, moved from Italy to Switzerland, from Switzerland to Holland, from Holland to Scotland, from Scotland to Trinity College, Dublin, which influenced Harvard and William and Mary. Boards of trustees are that old.

You have all heard, too, that the college presidency is an American invention, and that there are no offices like it anywhere in the world. The academic presidency, however, began in the thirteenth century. I've been able to trace its lineage because the American college is patterned not on Oxford and Cambridge Universities but on the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge Universities. These colleges use seven different titles for their chief administrators including warden, dean, rector, etc.; but the generic title is head. Five "heads" are called presidents. In a recent article written summarizing my forthcoming book, I have shown how the American presidency evolved from the headship of Oxford and Cambridge colleges. For example, the heads of Oxford and Cambridge Universities don't have tenure. They are in office two years and three years respectively, but the heads of Oxford and Cambridge colleges have permanent tenure -- until relatively recently had tenure for life. One American, incidentally, held a presidency for sixty-two years -- Eliphalet Nott, the first large philanthropist in higher education, who gave Union College a half a million dollars in 1855.

In the article I've just mentioned I review other facts that relate the American college and university presidency to the Oxford and Cambridge colleges. They show clearly that the office is an old, old institution and that we adapted it from English experience. As to the present situation, there are at least half a dozen other countries that have offices comparable to the college presidency in the United States -- Canada, Australia; Scotland has had them since the Reformation,

Holland has them, Belgium is now moving in that direction. Further, even where a short-termed chief executive functions, behind him is a permanent officer who has the power. If any of you know anything about English universities, you know that the registrar has the real power. He is a permanent officer.

The point I'm making is that I've used history because I've needed to understand why other people hold various historically-based ideas. The first time that I began to use it was at Ohio State. It was 1929 and student clientele work hadn't yet been accepted. One of my jobs was to help get it established. I met the argument that "You are upstarts and have no proper place in colleges and universities." So I did some historical research and found that the antecedents of the student clientele workers of today go all the way back to the medieval university. Thus I was able to help destroy the historical barrier to the development of the field in which you operate today.

I've mentioned already the notion of putting four years of college into two, and Mr. Hutchins' attempt in 1942 to establish a program which would lead to the Bachelor of Arts degree (some of us called it the bastard of arts degree) at the end of the sophomore year. As the result of historic research on eleven or twelve earlier attempts to do much the same thing, I predicted that the plan would fail, and it did fail in 1955.

I come next to the Outcome Taxons. I don't like this title but can't think of a better one. Products is the first of these taxons. We produce entertainment for the country not only in football games and athletic contests but also in concerts, art museums, art galleries and museums, and we're doing this very effectively internationally now. We're sending student orchestras abroad, we're doing all sorts of very effective things with this entertainment product of colleges and universities. But our product is essentially men and ideas, mostly knowledge and men and women whose knowledge, skills, and attitudes are the chief measure of our worth to mankind. All sorts of intangible as well as tangible products need to be sub-

taxonomized here, by the way.

Next comes the Personality Taxon. Personalities are the different facets of themselves displayed by institutions in different situations as well as to different people in the same situation. I know that the personality psychologists don't agree with this definition of personality and don't make the distinction that I was brought up with between personality and self; but I make it nonetheless and must stand the gaff from those who disagree. In any event, I consider that Stanford has many personalities, not just one.

It is the same thing with Reputations, the next taxon. I don't use the notion of image even though it's now the style. I would much prefer to go back to the Walter Lippmann term stereotypes which he introduced in his book of forty years ago, Public Opinion. In any case, every social institution, like every person, has many reputations. As for Character, as I wrote in my paper, it is now often called ethos. I prefer the old term of "character" which is essentially the basic self. We can get glimpses of it only -- glimpses of some of its multitudinous facets. We can particularly profit by finding those facets which show what an institution does and then attempt to interpret why it does what it does. Actions, in short, best reflect character. All of you have been at different institutions, either professionally, or as students, or both, and know what I'm talking about. My undergraduate college, Dartmouth, has a v stly different character from my graduate school, the University of Chicago. It was quite obvious when I switched that they were two different kinds of institutions, entirely different value systems, different characters, and so on. Stanford is quite different from Ohio State, Or Hamilton, or others. Character is persistent. It can be changed only slowly. Every institution has a persistent character that the sensitive perceive -- which everyone fact can perceive to a degree.

So much for the elucidation and the expansion of my Chicago paper and its outline. I move on now to discuss some of the limitations of the taxonomy. Some

of my friends say that no classification system is a taxonomy unless it can be used for prediction. I've asked them for support of that pronouncement, but as yet they haven't come up with any. I can justify, I think, calling my formulation a taxonomy; but that's too involved a task for this talk.

There are other criticisms, but I'll bypass them now, too. There are two deficiencies that I am aware of. Every social institution is an energy system. It takes in energy, converts energy, puts out energy. How to handle this fact in the taxonomy? I've been struggling with the problem for many years, but I don't know the answer. For a little while I discussed social institutions as organisms and ran into the concept of organicism, which has been severely and properly criticized by social scientists. The concept of organism intermingles so much with the concept of organicism that I had to drop that concept. However, a distinguished physiologist, Ralph Gerard, insists that we can call social institutions organisms. He has worked out a classification of structures of all sorts from single-cell animate creatures to complex societies. Somehow I've got to use his work in developing the taxonomy.

The energy problem is related to another that I've been working on longer than any other, namely, the concept of power. As a college president I saw the problem clearly. Who has power in a college or university? And what do we mean by power? How is it related to authority? A lot of people are working on these questions, but solid answers haven't yet been found. May I say that I define power differently from others I've read. I distinguish between power and energy. Energy is loose in the world, power is energy to some degree under the control of man. This is a distinction which may not hold up, but it is one which I have been using.

The time may come when we can assign power coefficients to taxons and subtaxons. We do it now in other contexts. We assign a power coefficient to students applying for admission -- I.Q.s and ratings from high school, etc. We put power coefficients of a sort on faculty members. We give them salaries that indicate

certain things concerning a professor's achievements or potentialities. This, too, is a type of power coefficient.

I think that eventually we'll be able to set up many such power coefficients and be able to deal with more of our own problems statistically. We are a long way from that now, but we move in that direction.

This is all I want to present formally. Now I'm ready to play goalie on the hockey field that I expect this session to turn into.

DISCUSSION

Question: Have you ever related this taxonomy to the system of secondary schools?

H. Cowley: No I haven't, because I don't know anything about the secondary schools. But I've made the generalization that I've had in mind for many years but have never done anything about that the basic course in education taught in colleges of education should be something comparable to this overview of the structure of the school, and education in other parts as it relates to the school.

Question: I wonder if you would tell us a little more about your views on university government and this notion of professors that they should run the whole show.

H. Cowley: Well, I can summarize it in a simple word; and the word is participation. All interested parties should participate in making the policy of universities. And this includes trustees. Unfortunately, many professors don't believe that trustees should do anything but rubberstamp. I don't believe this. I think trustees have an important function, demonstrable historically as a worthy function by and large. All interested parties -- trustees representing the general public, the professor of internal affairs, and students, to a degree, if they are competent -- should participate and alumni do participate, as a matter of fact. Harvard has 2 governing bodies, 2 legal governing bodies, one of which is the Board of Overseers, which is made up entirely of alumni elected by the alumni and they must approve major actions of the owning corporation. And this is very successful for Harvard. The AAUP has always held to this until very recently and now it has taken the position that professors should have the prime voice. Well, I don't know what they mean by "prime". Their committee on government used to have the word participate in their principles, but has now dropped it. I'm doing my damnest before they adopt it next April to make them put participation back in as a basic concept. I think this summarizes my general position.

J. Kagan: A question arising out of a debate we have been waging at Antioch for 7 or 8 years. There are two parts. When was it that the college first assumed responsibility for the mental and physical health of the student, that is, a responsibility beyond that implied by teaching? And what do you think are its philosophical implications? Here is the debate: on many campuses of our colleges, and Antioch is a good example, the faculty are getting increasingly disturbed over the sexual habits of their students. Now the problem is this: every college has restrictions but it goes only half way, you see, because it says to the student, you are a free and responsible person but don't get caught because we are going to do something. In other words it stops right on the fence. Suppose you said, you can't go half way. Either we must control you because you are not capable of responsible decisions or, and this is the debate, or you go back to the old European idea and say, no we are not responsible for your physical and mental health.

H. Cowley: That isn't the old European idea, although that's where it began. It began with the reorganized German university which opened in Berlin in 1809. Before that time the Germans didn't have it any more than any other medieval university and may I say historically it began with the fact that housing had to be provided for students and as housing was provided then discipline had to be provided. And counseling had to be provided along with discipline. Let's take

Oxford as a case in point. Oxford was a small town until fairly recently and thousands of students came into the town and something had to be done and students began to organize houses of their own and renting them themselves. In the course of time the university required that every house had to have a Master of Arts in residence who was responsible for its finances and also its discipline, and also to be the counselor of the students that were younger. This was the beginning.

Comment: It's been argued that the American university, the comprehensive university, has unique features as compared to the European universities, in the sense more recently, at least, of the massive intrusion of what we call the training of service people. I am thinking in particular of the schools of social work, social psychology, departments of psychology in certain places, and of course guidance and other auxiliary professions where there is great and heated dialogue between the professors who insist, mainly in the graduate school, that the function of the university is the communication and development of knowledge, as against those who insist its responsibility is to train, in effect, technicians.

H. Cowley: Well this is an old debate and I think it's already resolved. We have resolved that with our diversity in structure, and California is a good example of this. California has 3 systems of higher education (I am talking about public higher education). It has the University of California with its 8 campuses, which is selective. We have the state college system which has 16 units and soon will have 18 which serves many high level students but whose central tendency of abstract intelligence is lower, but it serves professions to a large degree. And then we have the junior colleges, 1/2 of which are technical institutes serving on a low level. Now this is our resolution and we are going to stick with this resolution regardless of the criticisms that come from the Flexners and the Hutchinsons.

California within the past 2 years has attempted to force out some of these service schools. They have attempted to force out criminology. Education was next on the list to force out. They didn't succeed with criminology, but these efforts will be made again and will be made by men who don't understand the kind of system that we have evolved in our diversity. We then will have to justify the place of those that are already in that they try to force out and one of the jobs of the educationist is to defend his right to be in a university.

FURTHER QUESTIONS FROM THE SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

What do you see as happening to the role of the student in the American college? Is his role changing? If so, how? What is happening to his relationship to the college?

Can we construct a taxonomy of an institution as perceived and felt by the students going through it, and if so, wouldn't this be a more useful concept for the guidance process?

How can we avoid "hardening of categories"?

How can the counselor in the "clientele services" initiate change in the "characteristics" of the whole organization?

JOINT DISCUSSION OF KIMBALL AND COWLEY PAPERS

E. Gordon: I have a few questions and comments for Dr. Kimball. I was particularly interested in your use of the natural history method. I was troubled by some things. One has to select a point of origin at which to start looking at a group of people or evaluating their history but in the arbitrary selection of this point it seems to me of crucial importance that we not exclude any of the critical antecedents or variables that may influence this description. For example, important light might have been thrown on the relationship of these girls in the dormitory if we knew something about what happened before they came together. You were concerned about them as a part of the group so you picked them up when they came together geographically. Also, in your analysis of our educational system, you chose to begin at 1870. I suppose there were many reasons for that -- the facilitating and impeding factors in our society cannot be really understood without concern for at least the prior hundred years. The third point which caused me a bit of concern was the material that relates to the concept of the role of corporate form. This form has emerged as an efficient way of assembling capital in the history of our country. I am not sure, however, that it was as important a factor in the assembly of capital as was the opportunity provided for the exploitation of natural and human resources in the early period of the development of this country. I feel the importance of the use of this method of research, the natural history method shouldn't be overlooked but we shouldn't overlook, at the same time, the crucial points of variables and antecedents.

My second comment is that I was very pleased with your picking up the strand of conflict in the field about the extent to which we should intrude ourselves into the lives of others. We talked about the concepts of responsibility and freedom. They must be considered in some context. I think we should consider them in the context of the social system and social values. For most of our history we have been concerned with gaining mastery over the laws of natural processes and natural events and the utilization of this mastery to manipulate and control material and non-material phenomena. We are concerned with understanding the power of various kinds of energies. We are concerned with understanding the laws of health and illness; we use this understanding not to be victims of natural events, but to manipulate and control natural events. Yet, there is among some of us some resistance or reluctance to accept the fact that the same process applies in the management and facilitation of human development.

There are some of us who may, in our objectivity, stand on the sidelines until the crisis comes. When learning or development proceeds normally, at the maximal level, this issue may not be of great importance. But when learning or development is not proceeding at a maximal level, it can become critical. If we have a child who has been handicapped by physical malformation, we do not stand by and let this child develop in a distorted way. When we look at children who are handicapped socially and psychologically by their cultural deprivations, I'm not sure that we are talking about freedom when we say to such a child, "You are free to continue to develop in a distorted fashion." What is necessary, is that persons who have some commitment to what we can do at this stage of history intrude themselves into the lives of such children and try to help them, in the kind of direction that will be corrective, because as they move into later life, unless they can develop mastery of the management

of knowledge and the management of themselves, there is no real freedom for them.

My last comment has to do with your concept of perception as being culturally determined. I am not sure that I want to accept the possibility that the formulation of perception is cultural. For an example, you talked about Darwin's missing the glacial marks. I suspect that he, in a very narrow sense, perceived the marks but they had no meaning for him. Cognition did not take place, until he had developed another body of knowledge. This is important to me because I have been struggling with the concept of learning disabilities of socially and culturally disadvantaged children. They may be the result of certain kinds of deprivations in the experiences of these children. And in an attack upon varying disabilities it is particularly important that we distinguish the nature of the defect. Whether the defect is in perception or in cognition may influence the design of corrective learning experience. I think it would be in cognition rather than perception.

S. Kimball: On the last point I am not sure I am quite clear whether you were saying that the variable is in cognitive style and the invariable or the constant is the organic. There is evidence now, for example, that the types of distortion which Americans have - for example, we look at something in a laboratory which looks rectangular but is actually not - that this type of distortion does not appear among some other peoples in the world. It is directly related to the cultural forms characteristic of those people. We have tended to assume, you see, that this type of perceptive distortion is a universal of the organic being. There are many other peoples where the principal cultural concept of space is circular and not rectangular; they get a different kind of perceptual distortion than the kind we get. There is a possibility of the cultural situation determining what we will perceive to be an organic perceptual problem. This doesn't, of course, rule out organic problems stemming from such things as diet.

E. Gordon: Work is being done on the problem of distinguishing between cognition and perception. What we seem to know about perception can only be understood in terms of prior cognitive functions. When I say, "This is a circle I see," even at that point cognition has taken place. There is evidence that there are specific disturbances that relate to specific perceptual distortions, as well as specific disturbances that relate to cognitive style. This evidence was found from study of a brain-damaged population, but it may be applicable to a non-brain-damaged, but otherwise damaged population.

S. Kimball: To respond to your last point first, I don't know enough about it. It sounds like a logical distinction. However, it seems to me we would still be dealing with the problem of cognitive perception also as a culturally induced style.

The second point: I'm not going to comment on that except to this extent: it seems to me that in any area of development, such as guidance, there is a differentiation between what one may call a "professional responsibility," which is what you're talking about, in terms of responsibility to do these kinds of things which are called for in the professional realm of a guidance counselor, and that kind of "responsible" behavior where a person injects social class morality, the need to satisfy his own ego problems, or the striving for power, in terms of manipulation. Where you draw the line is pretty difficult. It seems to me there needs to be, in terms of professional training,

a very clear distinction of ethics such as the medical profession has.

The first point is one in which I would say the questions you raise are primarily the result of the inadequacy of time to give full treatment to the problem at hand. I am only too aware that the antecedents in all of these situations are significant elements in what occurs. For example: the pattern of migration in New England, was one of colonies of people moving from an established settlement to a new one where they re-established themselves in precisely the same structural form, including social groupings, values, church, kinds of buildings. They did this all the way to Downes, Kansas, which is the most Western outpost of New England. You can also find these little villages in Michigan, in Northern Ohio. The cultural antecedents of New Englanders in village form can be traced right back to Essex County, England and from there to North Germany. This knowledge about this kind of an antecedent social and cultural form is absolutely essential to understanding.

As far as the corporate form is concerned, that is a very complex thing. I only want to point out that the corporate form has been in existence for a very long time; it began to be used more extensively about the 16th century. It was used primarily by the kings of England as a means of getting around their aristocracy. What happened in this country along about 1840 was the joining of the factory system, which originally was not tied up with capitalism -- capitalism, you see, was banking and mercantilism -- the joining of the factory-system production of goods, in a form of organization called the corporate system. Along about 1840 in this country these three things came together. The anthropologist would treat them in terms of antecedents, three different streams of things which happened to join. Curiously enough, in the debates over the New York State Constitution of 1848, the people who fought the corporate form and attempted to prevent its liberalization included the bankers, the big merchants and the big landowners, the conservatives. The people who fought for the corporate system were the small landowners, the small entrepreneurs, and the small farmers. These are the antecedent kind of things that one would go into in examining the history of the corporate form, and its evolution and its modifications.

M. Borrowman: I would like to address Hal Cowley. His speech was a tremendously erudite and exciting one but it had another quality too, that of honesty. I want to put to you, Hal, What is a taxonomy for? I want to explain why I asked this question. It seems to me that anyone that holds the holistic view, as you call it, is constantly aware that when we make a classification, and put things into categories we are separating parts from the whole. We are examining them perhaps not from Aristotle's position, with his idea that after examining them we can put them together and see the whole, but with the modern intent, which would be to understand the whole to some extent better, without presuming that we knew the whole when we put the parts together. What I'm asking now is how do we deal with this turmoil of the spirit which I feel over making a classification. When we start from the holistic position, we feel that we are doing violence to that position when we separate the parts.

H. Cowley: May I begin with your question "What is the taxonomy for?" Anybody who makes a classification has his own purpose. My purpose is a descriptive purpose, an effort to present to my students an overview of American higher education, descriptive of the situation as the taxonomy brings it up and also descriptive of something I didn't have the time to talk about much this afternoon and that is its friction points. In the forty hours that I reduced

to one this afternoon one of the major points is the points of conflict that evolve between "functions." After all, the two functions of teaching and research are constantly in conflict. How then do we become aware of the conflict and what possible resolutions are there of this conflict? This is descriptive, you see. As for your other point: dividing up the whole into parts and losing the whole in the process, well, this is the danger of any analysis. This has happened in medicine; they've gone in for all sorts of specialties. Medicine has attempted to resolve this problem through the development of the internist, as an attempt to bring the whole together. The internist has his limitations because most of them know very little about psychiatry and so you have another type of correlator in the psychiatrist. So medicine, an ancient profession, which goes back to the ancient world, has been struggling with this for many centuries and has come to these resolutions which we all recognize to be inadequate. How in a new field, such as the study of institutions (I am not only talking about the study of the institutions of higher education, but all institutions,) which is a relatively new enterprise, how can we expect to be nearly as far along even as medicine is? It seems to me we'll never even face the problem of putting parts together until we have the parts.

D. Russell: In the process of breaking down into parts, let's say you have chosen as a function of the university the teaching and research function.

H. Cowley: As the core function.

D. Russell: And this represents then a decision on your part on the particular aspect of the functions that are relevant. Suppose, however, you are defining functions in a more holistic way. For example, supposing you are defining the objective of education as being the encouragement and facilitation of learning and development of knowledge. Now you have it focused upon an individual who is profiting by many different experiences within the educational framework. Then it seems to me you would not be faced with this problem that you considered in your paper, where counseling is considered complementary to the educational process. By this other more holistic definition, counseling is an integral and focal point of this development of the individual, not an ancillary. There would be a lot of other functions, such as the extra-curricular activities, that would then be subsumed as central rather than peripheral processes. For this reason, I can see that a redefinition of your taxonomy in a slightly different manner might lead to a new approach to the whole of education.

H. Cowley: I can respond to that in two ways. This is descriptive of the situation as I see it. This is not an idealized system; it is of the situation as it is. You're talking, it seems to me, about an idealized system. Second, I would say that if anybody who wants to make another taxonomy and present it in opposition to this, so that we have two to look at, or several, then we can develop the judgment -- the consensus of the best informed opinions in the Charles Sanders Peirce sense -- as to what is the most useful. After all, what is science but the consensus of the experts? I don't say this is the taxonomy, I say this is mine, as I see the situation as it is. You are suggesting an idealized taxonomy of what ought to be. I begin my course by saying I'm not interested in what ought to be. I don't believe in hortatory enterprises in science. I say "this is as it is"; if anybody else wants to say "this is what ought to be" that's his business. It's not what I'm trying to do. Does that bear on your point?

D. Russell: Well, up to a point. This point would be: a good argument could be made that the type of taxonomy based upon the holistic approach that we are concerned with here is just as logical if we want to define our educational functions that way.

H. Cowley: But is it descriptive of the situation that we are now in?

D. Russell: I'm not so sure that it is. I think we have different perceptions perhaps, but the same procedure. There are people who are in the educational spheres who consider the focal point of education to be the individual, and the development of this individual is a process that goes on in all the functions of the university and not only the study of knowledge and the facilitating of this study.

H. Cowley: I object to the contrast you're making here, but in any case, you say there are people who so consider. Of course, there are. But are these people running the educational program in this country?

D. Russell: Is there a danger that a taxonomy of this kind might have the effect of stabilizing...

H. Cowley: There's always this danger. But you notice this is called a "tentative" taxonomy. This is one of the reasons for that. The point you make is that there are other approaches to taxonomies - that it might just as well be hortatory, and that one could move in that direction. A taxonomy, it seems to me, is descriptive, and I think that the argument should be: "Is it or is it not descriptive?", rather than is it desirable or undesirable. I don't think this is the issue. I think we could debate the other point -- whether or not we ought to be what we aren't and I could make as strong a case of this as you do. But I don't think we will face those problems until we find out first where we are. Go back to Lincoln's sentence in the Lincoln-Douglas Debates: "We won't know where to go until we first know where we are."

J. Kagan: Hal, although I basically agree with your position, it's dangerous for you to say that the validity of your taxonomy can be shown by consensus. The consensus in the 15th century said the world was square or flat. Consensus is not a test of the validity of your taxonomy.

H. Cowley: It is at any one point. May I point out that the concepts of physics of today have changed from those of the fifteenth or sixteenth century only because the consensus of scientists has changed. I'm saying that this taxonomy or any taxonomy will change as the consensus changes. I'm not saying the consensus will always be the same.

J. Kagan: You're saying one thing more, namely that if your taxonomy -- let's take Russell's suggestion -- is really not the correct one, then you cannot test its validity merely by asking people for a vote as to which they think is more plausible.

H. Cowley: I would disagree with that; may I swing over to linguistics for a moment? I wrote an article about 30 years ago entitled "The Nature of Student Personnel Work," in which I made this analogy: we call an apple an apple because this is the consensus; if I were able to convince a group of people that it wasn't an apple and from now on we call it a thingamabob, and

I could get people to call it that, by God, it would be that for all the people who call it that. This is consensus. We are having this debate right now about the Third Edition of Webster's International. What gets into that dictionary? What determines this? It is usage -- consensus, and with an entirely different audience than used to be the audience that determined the Second and First Editions. The first consensus was determined by a verbal elite. And now the third one is determined by the usage of the common man. That's why when you speak of consensus, you must tell what your body of consensus is. I would say that in science, (Peirce made this quite clear in his distinguished, great article which put pragmatism on its way in 1878) a scientific judgment is the judgment of those who are entitled to a judgment.

N. Hobbs: "Informed" judgment is what you mean. Does anyone else wish to speak to Cowley's point?

G. Phillips: You mentioned one of my very favorite people: Charles Sanders Peirce. He said something about three levels of belief: on the first level we believe but don't know why. The second is the authoritative level. This is what science does where it comes out mere description of things as they are. The supreme level of belief is the will to believe. This was Einstein's kind of belief when he said $e = mc^2$. That is not a description; that goes beyond description and to me this is the genuine role of science. It's the genuine kind of faith that man has when he is genuinely scientific. What I'm trying to say is that description has its place and I never want to minimize its value but I don't think we should confuse this with science.

H. Cowley: I have no objection to someone coming along with high faith and making a new taxonomy that has to do with mc^2 and I will stand my ground that this is a second level taxonomy. So what?

G. Phillips: Let it happen; encourage it.

H. Cowley: Good. If you'll accept it on that basis then I would say to those who want to mc^2 , let them mc^2 all over the place and let me react to it. I don't minimize the hortatory but I say this is not my job.

M. Borrowman: Some people wish that the central function of the school were defined differently, but if we're going to take the Peirce kind of judgment here then the community informs us through the labeling of the budget that teaching and research are to be defined as core functions and others are complementary.

E. Westervelt: I am puzzled that Dr. Cowley does not seem to draw a clear distinction between scientific consensus and popular consensus, as the latter is illustrated by the functions of education being defined by what Merle just said about the way budgets are going.

H. Cowley: This is just a descriptive fact. I don't object to having an idealized taxonomy and I think we move ahead by this sort of hortatory proposal but they are always examined in the last analysis by the guys who operate the present show and who will react to this. Let's get back to the dictionary. Who makes a dictionary but lexicographers who are the scientists of the language?

H. McCully: Then what Cowley is doing in his taxonomy is reporting the contemporary scene?

H. Cowley: And the historic.

H. McCully: That is tantamount to saying in the case of a hospital that the purpose of establishing a hospital is to make a place where doctors can practice. It completely misses the end point of education which is the educative process that goes on in the individual student.

H. Cowley: Historically this isn't so. Historically Oxford and Cambridge Colleges were established for the furthering of the interests of knowledge and the scholars of the Church of England; pupils were taken on, or "scholars" as they were called, quite incidentally. This is the history of it.

SUMMARY PANEL -- THURSDAY MORNING

Adrian Van Kaam, Solon Kimball, Nicholas Hobbs

E. Lloyd-Jones: There is a problem facing us in guidance on which philosophy has had a lot more to say than any other discipline. That's the problem with which we started Monday morning, the problem of freedom and responsibility. As I follow the literature in the field of guidance and counseling, I observe that we seem to latch on to this, but we seem to do it in a pretty unsophisticated way, without the background of understanding that we might have if we had the help of those who have given a great deal of thought to it.

The Steering Committee, whose job here has been to keep its collective ear to the ground -- to listen, and think, and ultimately reach a decision about what to do next -- decided at breakfast this morning that we must come back to this problem of responsibility. Our good friend Adrian Van Kaam, has been sitting here knowing that he would pick up on the concerns which we had allocated particularly to Rollo, which Rollo couldn't stay to do for us. Rollo seems to be willing to delegate everything except maybe the concerns for his children and a few things like that to Father Van Kaam. He has apparently the greatest confidence in his position, the way he thinks, the way he can communicate and so forth and so on. It's wonderful to have this much faith. I'm complimenting Rollo, you see, at this point as well as you. And we -- the Steering Committee who meets over in the corner at breakfast and conspires as to the use of your time during the day -- we thought that this morning ought to center around the leadership of Father Van Kaam, his perspective on freedom and responsibility, and his study of it. He is a psychologist, and a psychotherapist (it's gotten almost to be a dirty word so I take that back. Forget he's a psychotherapist). He is a thinker.

Then, as we discussed this decision and how these two hours could be used

to the greatest advantage, it became apparent that Sol Kimball had a kind of an external fix on this problem which we needed, which we could use, so we said, Sol, sit up here with us, come on in, give your perspective on the problem as Van Kaam will set it for us.

Then we could see that Nick had a good night and his color was pretty good and all that, but he seemed unusually kind of pink, sort of florid, and somebody remembered that poor Nick has sat up here with his eyebrows twitching, and somebody said, "Could you see his foot?" Now I couldn't see his foot, so I haven't been able to study the pattern of his foot tapping as an expression of his feelings. But I did notice this eyebrow business, whatever it is that he does, although I can't demonstrate. Well, we didn't take his bloodpressure or anything, but we thought not only for his sake, but also because Nick has a great concern for this subject, that he'd better be free to get in on this exchange too. Then the question was who would referee while Nick enjoyed a different role, and that task has been assigned to me.

Finally, we are sure because of the way these three people are and the pattern that's been set, there will be plenty of interaction with you. This we consider urgent, because one or two people have already told me that they aren't going to be able to stand it, they can't face it sitting quiet this morning. Okay, we'll try not to send you home burst completely, with your seams all apart.

Father Van Kaam, what have you to say to us about this problem of freedom and responsibility as you think it comes to focus, particularly for those who are not, let's say, not psychotherapists? A few of you have told me during the conference that you do feel yourselves this kind of person, but we would like to focus the discussion this morning, for those of us who do not feel that this is our particular role or function, that it isn't what we want to do.

A. Van Kaam: I am very glad to try to bring to the fore certain ideas about freedom and responsibility and even to try to relate it to your special situation as counselors. First of all, it is true, as you said, I'm now a psychotherapist, but I was at one time in counseling in my own country, the Netherlands, counseling on a state team for the workers, for a long time, and counseling for people in religion.

Therefore I would like to open my consideration of freedom and responsibility in relation to counseling in this way, that I think that the idea of freedom, autonomy and the fostering of freedom and autonomy is even more directly relevant for the counselor than for the psychotherapist, because the counselor is faced with people who supposedly are nearer to the possibility of autonomy than the psychotherapist-psychiatrist is, because psychiatrists and psychotherapists usually get people who have lost that freedom of autonomy, who are not able at all to take a stand, to take a position, to interact in the dialogue with reality in a personal way. It takes sometimes months of psychotherapy before people are able to dare to see, to dare to build, to dare to take a stand, while the counselor in the school is faced with people who are not that disturbed at all, who are ready in a sense to be helped by the counselor to decide to be able to take a stand.

It is important for the counselor to think about this freedom as we see it in two ways. First he must see what it means for himself. The counselor today is inserted in a society that is highly organized, in a school system that is highly pervasive and he may be seduced into thinking he can't do anything. He may seem to himself to be simply a kind of toy boat in the water in this stream, unable to take any step, to improve anything. As the school administrator's assistant, what can he do after all? Thus, for himself, it is important for him to see what freedom means in a limited situation. Secondly, for the student, I think -- and I may be wrong, and you may contest this -- that the main part of

the counselor job comes down to helping the student to be more autonomist, to be more free, to be more himself. Those real tasks imply all the things he's doing and helping the student to do.

Now, let me look at the idea of freedom from the existential viewpoint. In the idea of freedom from the existential viewpoint there is one important term -- we never speak about freedom as such, but always about situated freedom -- freedom in a situation. Or we talk about dialectic freedom -- which is another way of saying it -- dialectic, situated freedom. Or we say embodied freedom. What do those terms mean -- embodied, situated, incarnated, dialectical, what do they mean? They mean that there is no such thing as absolute freedom; it means that our freedom is extremely limited, extremely small. It is never absolute, it is never isolated, it is only freedom in a dialogue with, in an interaction with all kinds of deterministic factors around us.

And here we have to go a little more into theoretical points to bring to the fore historically how this idea came about. One of the great men that prepared existential thinking, one of the really great thinkers we have to be grateful to is Karl Marx. Now unfortunately Marx is underestimated for many reasons. One reason is that the Soviets in Russia accept the points of his many writings as merely a kind of dogma, and so have lost the crux of the really important big ideas of Karl Marx. Secondly, Marx himself loaded his books with all kinds of data that sometimes were not so exact about economic life, so many people started to underestimate him as simply a man collecting a lot of data and not a thinker who was really changing our view of man. However, the main message of Karl Marx, we think now, is that man is always embedded in a situation. To him the situation was basically economic. We can fight about whether he is right in that kind of description. But the main point is that before we think about it or we reflect, we are already in a situation. If we are bourgeoisie, as he calls it, then we cannot think as a proletarian because our situation already has impact

on our thinking. Or, if you are a proletarian, then you think and feel differently than a bourgeoisie. In other words, man is always prereflectively already in a situation. You as an American, I as a Dutchman -- we are already in certain ground situations we cannot escape. We are inserted in this situation. However, and here comes existential thinking -- Maurice Merleau-Ponty has brought it out especially -- this situation is still not a situation of linear causality that is absolutely totally determining in a linear line; that is, I am here and there is nothing possible for me; I simply undergo; experience simply comes on me.

We have to be careful, however, that we don't do away with all causality. That is one point that influences me absolutely. Instead of that we talk, with Merleau-Ponty, French existentialist, about circular causality. Circular causality means that at the same time there are all kinds of courses working, influencing each other. There are all kinds of influences impinging on me and I cannot escape that; they are there. But I am here, too, and I can assimilate, react to these, so I can take a stand. I cannot evade these events totally, cannot completely overcome them, but to a certain degree I can take them in hand -- to a very small degree. But the small degree to which I can be a partner in this dialectical movement -- that small degree is very important, because to the degree that I respond to this ability in me, you know, to take part in the dialogue, to that degree I am growing, I am becoming, I am somebody. I am emerging; I am existing.

When we apply this notion to the school situation today, what do we see? We are necessarily in an extremely organized society; we are in an extremely organized school system; we are called upon, as are many of our students later, to be members of many highly organized companies. In other words, our students all will be inserted, and are already inserted in school, in a highly structured pattern that impinges on them from all sides, influences them on all sides. They have to conform to many things that are good but also things that are not

so good. There are also things that are very unpleasant. That is not only true of the child, but also true of the counselor.

Now, how to salvage the human personality, how to make the human personality an active factor, an autonomic factor to a degree in the situation? One possibility is, and this is a wrong one, to denounce the situation, to get out of the real situation and to dream of an idea about absolute freedom; to say to hell with the whole system and flee from it. In that case, you are not free because you are out of the dialogue, you are isolated; you are going to be schizoric -- not schizophrenic, but schizoric, out of it; feeling is lost there, too.

Another way is a complete giving up of any personal stand. That means you are in the school situation as a child, a student, or as a counselor or as a teacher. And you say, now there it is. I don't care. Let things go by. I won't take any stand. That is complete and total resignation.

Now the inbetween stand, which we think is the stand of existential freedom, is to say that I am faced with a situation. I, the school child, am faced with a situation at home that is lousy, for instance, and I see at the school a teacher who is unpleasant. I have tried and people who help me, like my counselor, have tried, too, to change the situation at home, to change the situation with the teacher, but it fails. It doesn't work. What can I do now? "I'm getting tired of this and I give up", I can say. But I can also say, "This situation, in-so-far as it is not changeable at the moment, still can but has not encroached upon my inner freedom." I can decide that I will try to withstand it, in a sense, instead of letting the situation fall on me like a ton of bricks. I have to take it; I have to stand it. I will find some motivation, some value in this course, for instance; I will keep myself in the school; or, I want to get a degree. I don't agree with the situation; I will look upon it and I will think what I can do about it. I will be open to every little opportunity that occurs where I can jump in, and change things a little bit.

Because the interesting thing is, as soon as I, as a child, or I, as a counselor, or I as a teacher, take a stand in this way, then my perceptual system is able to see the slightest opening where I can do a little changing -- very little, perhaps, but some. And if everyone, you know, is standing in that way, waiting for a little opening, then we can do a lot.

This kind of thinking, of course, developed very much in Europe during the Nazi occupation. I was in the Resistance and was very interested in this thing. This was our basic philosophy, in the beginning at least; later we were able to do a little more -- to fight with weapons more than in the beginning. But it was there, we were in the system; we didn't agree with it, of course. We had to comply to a high degree at the outset, because otherwise we would have been destroyed. But because we were not agreeing, we kept open, our perceptual systems were alert for every slightest opening, into which we could move. There a little thing, there a little thing, move in, move in. We know that you can in this way commit slight changes.

Of course we had to do a lot of dreaming, dreaming based on idealism. Of course, dreams and ideals can also take us away from reality. But you have to have big plans in order to be alert to where you have to do this, and that. We had big plans in the time of the Nazis, you know -- to get them out at once. That was impossible, but in the long run they did get out. One can have big plans and still be very realistic and develop responsibility -- the ability to respond -- to respond to reality every time there opens up a little chance, a little possibility for inserting what I feel, what I stand for, with other people.

Now this is, in a nutshell, the idea of situated freedom. Rollo May himself, of course, has this idea, the idea of what we call situated freedom, dialectical freedom. I am sure I was perhaps not too concrete in many ways, but my good friends here will help me to be more concrete in the discussion later.

E. Lloyd-Jones: Sol, do you want to comment?

S. Kimball: At the breakfast table, in discussing this, it looked as if we might get into a dogfight here, but as I've heard Father Van Kaam talk, I discover that that which I would say is in no way as I can see it divergent whatever from his position, although I am anything but an existentialist. I am deeply on the empiricist side, in looking at the world in which we live, but what I hear you say is empiricism and not existentialism, so therefore it makes it appropriate for me to accept it.

But I could at least give an emphasis to what I think will be complementary or supplementary to what has just preceded. And in giving a different emphasis I think I might also pose a problem of a kind that should be taken into consideration. When you look comparatively at different peoples of the world and see their behavior, see the relation between the kinds of ways in which they group themselves and their kinds of philosophical views of the world, you can see that there are correspondences between their world views and the way in which they are grouped. You can also see, where such opportunities are present for you to observe, that changes in world views do occur and they do occur in relationship to changes in the ways in which people are grouped. So that what I should like to pose is something directly out of anthropology and is one of the types of problems, it seems to me, that people who counsel have to face.

Among the Zuni Indians, a group of thirty-five hundred people living south of Mexico, you have a society for which the best brief description would be that it is a closed system. It is so closed that, despite outside contact, beginning in 1540 with the Spanish and with the usually very successful attempts by the Catholic Church to convert people to Christianity, the Zunis have remained during all these years particularly resistant to missionary effort, whether it is Catholic on the one hand or, later, Presbyterian, on the other. They've remained resistant to this because, among other things, their view of freedom and

responsibility is so vastly different from that which is contained within the religious dogmas which others have attempted to give to them.

And let me explain this explicitly. Whenever there are, let us say, social responsibilities within this community of Zuni -- and it's a Colony, these people live together in a pueblo-type system -- no person would ever volunteer under any circumstances for a position of leadership, because the minute that you take this kind of a step you separate yourself from the others ever so much. Now this is condemned socially, but it is also condemned supernaturally. So, by taking leadership responsibility, you make yourself a target for social censure that comes through malicious gossip, character-destroying gossip, but you are also a target for witchcraft. And the very fact that you have taken a step of initiative, of non-conformity, if you will, you see, leaves you open to either having others believe you are a witch or having witches act upon you.

Now the evidence of this is in what happened first of all in the Zuni response to the draft of the Second World War. The Zunis were drafted because the machinery of the American Government reached all people. The Zunis -- I'm not sure without exception, but at least the Zunis generally -- who were drafted asked to be deferred on the grounds that they were priests, and that priests, that is practitioners of religion, were exempt from military service. What happened here was that the United States Government, or the people who ran it, not knowing the true facts, felt they were probably draft evaders and denied this and took them all into the United States Army. From a purely technical point of view, the Zunis were right, because the system is one in which, when a person is initiated into the system, he then must assume certain priestly functions and must be prepared, you see, to act with others in these priestly functions. When the Zunis came back from the Second World War, and the GI Bill was available for educational training of one kind or another, not one single Zuni took advantage of the GI Bill of Rights. This required, you see, an act of

self-initiation on one hand. Secondly it would put you out and cause you to be divergent from the others.

Now is it the case that all the Zunis over the years have been able to maintain this stand? No, they have not. So whenever there appears a person, you see, who questions this business of being uniform, of being just like all the others, two or three things happen. One is, in the former times, he was killed. This was one way by which this type of society disposed of its deviants. In these days, what happens is that he may remove himself from the village and build a house at some distance, a hundred yards or a quarter of a mile, or a half mile, so that you do find in the vicinity of the Zuni village now, a number of these families who, in effect, have moved out of this system.

Now the second group that I want to refer to in contrast to this are the Navaho Indians, who live in the vicinity of the Zuni but also in a great territory elsewhere, to the north. The Navaho system is what we would label an open system. It is a system in which the world view is one in which perfection is never achieved. There is never utopia, but man's destiny is to forever struggle, and so in the kind of teaching and in the supernatural behavior and in the mythology of these people, this is the theme that comes through. This is the theme to which the Navaho youth are subjected, and this is one of the reasons why in our lifetime, you will read in the popular magazines, if you have not already read, about the most magnificent and wonderful transformation of the Navaho tribe, not only in terms of adapting to American culture but in terms of their ability to exploit the forms of the American culture. This is what they're up to. It's a remarkable transition which they consciously, on their own, decided to do and how to do it.

Well, you see, the problem I'm raising is this -- from what position does one counsel Navahos and from what position counsel Zunis? What I'm trying to say is, among other things, that in the United States there are regional

differences, there are social class differences. There are differences of ethnic background and of religion. And although there are individual differences within the kinds of groups, nevertheless there is a pervading cultural pattern out of which people come which has some relevance to the nature both of the counseling activities as well as the ability, you see, to establish any kind of rapport with the individuals with whom you are carrying these things on.

Now as a last comment, in response to what Father Van Kaam said to us about the person who revolts against his heredity and denies it, the person who is willing to work within just a limited situation if he can achieve just this much and so forth. Certainly American society, as I understand it at the moment, is one in which most of us who are truly dedicated to the movement of our type of society towards the realization of the kinds of values which we hold most important, one of which is the code of development of the individual, must always be willing to work in terms of that little iota, that small little thing which can be accomplished. This is true not just in a concentration camp, and not just in a resistance movement, but within our society also. We too have to work in terms of the fact that we cannot sit around the cracker barrel and tell President Kennedy exactly what he should have done in Cuba and ask why he didn't do it this way. Any realistic evaluation of the situation indicates that it is not possible for any of us to make those kinds of decisions which affect the global situation. And therefore we have to be willing to take a little step in the direction we think is right.

But people who can act that way are only those who have a commitment to the society, or perhaps to themselves. What I should like to suggest here, is that the nature of our society is one in which many people either never develop commitment, or, if commitment is developed, the society tends to destroy it in far too many people. Therefore, it isn't possible, because of certain aspects of our society, to have a very large group who are thus ready for these tiny little

steps. We have on the one extreme, you see, those who withdraw from our society completely; these are the beatnik type. We have those who are the commuters to New York City, who are the rat-race and withdrawal type. This is the way they view their life. It's a rat-race, and this is the way they talk about it. They don't have commitment to the society; not at all. Then we have people who do have a sense of commitment, and who are willing to operate in terms of that little bit of progress which can be made either in terms of a contribution to society, if you wish, or to oneself.

One last point about this, and this is in terms of a different emphasis; the emphasis that I feel Father Van Kaam gave us is on the individual; the emphasis that I would give, while recognizing fully the significance of the individual, is on the social system. That is, my emphasis is on the situation that Father Van Kaam is referring to. I would say that certain kinds of social arrangements do not favor commitment, when commitment is regarded in the sense of becoming a fully participant member of society. I think that an educational system which increasingly apparently controls the individual, directs him, supervises him, and reduces his freedom and autonomy is a system which never lets this kind of capacity for commitment of the individual develop. It is no wonder, you see, that we have such a large section of our population in a rat-race and withdrawal frame of mind. Although the counselor with a heavy therapeutic or psychological orientation will attempt to work with the individual, and get him to see some of these things, I would say that there is also another plane of operation. That plane of operation is the systemic plane, the plane of human organization. Here we plan for organizational structures which create environments within which there is greater opportunity to develop the worth of the person to himself and to our society.

E. Lloyd-Jones: Nick, what an opportunity you have! Go on.

N. Hobbs: I appreciate very much the opportunity to talk. These last few days have been marvelous for me in many ways, but they've been excruciatingly painful. I have had seventeen brilliant insights during the course of these conversations, which would have brought exquisite clarity to the group. My problem is that I can't remember what any of them were. However, the restriction of freedom which I have experienced has really been better than freedom to talk because I have learned so much from hearing you talk.

On this issue I do get some feeling, I think, as well as some rationality, because I think I basically distrust a solution to this problem. I have to begin with a considerable amount of doubt and uncertainty with respect to this issue. I think perhaps there is no solution to the problem. I find myself in a peculiar position; at home I am reading and espousing the existential position, and then, here, when it is presented so eloquently and cogently, with such conviction and passion and intelligence, I want to resist it. I would feel that death is not the major source of existential anxiety, but this very issue of life (of course you can say death is the same as this) as it's lived in terms of freedom and responsibility and existential anguish. I don't want a solution to this problem, I guess, basically. I want to keep struggling with it; I suspect men are going to keep struggling with it no matter what we say here today.

Now at this juncture, just for heuristic purposes, I want to overstate my position. There's so much richness in what Father Van Kaam has said and in what Rollo May has said; I respect and respond to it. But taken out of its current persuasive setting of the anguish that Europe has gone through, the concentration camps and so on which arouse in us right away a responsive feeling, this is a position that is quite ancient; it has been summarized in a bit of doggerel, "Stone walls do not a prison make, nor iron bars a cage". It has a contemporary cogency because it's translated now into current issues, but this is the basic point, it seems to me.

One of the core difficulties, as I see it, in Father Van Kaam's position and Rollo May's position is the labeling as "free" the type of response that you happen to approve of. That is, the tactic that Father Van Kaam advocated for resistance was one that fits into our value system, it's very admirable, it fits into his value system, and he then labels it as "free". I would suggest that a Ghandi type response, to the adherents of Ghandi would be equally given the more favorable label, you see, of free. There's a danger in this, because you then deny martyrdom to many people who chose to be a symbol rather than to survive. I say that Ghandi's followers chose, in this context, using the language of the system, freely to die rather than to survive; other people might also prefer that mode of response.

Or you can take Rollo May's illustration; you can put it into conditioning terms, if you will, with the illustration of the slap by the prison guard. Now the response that Rollo approves, and I do, too, and it is a part of our culture, is when I'm slapped, to stop and think about what my purpose is, what am I trying to achieve, how does this fit into my value system, and then to make a response that's consonant with that. Had we been on this mountain top in 1906 when this house was built and had another speaker, we might well have had the point presented with equal eloquence that a Christian turns the other cheek, no matter what. He doesn't think; he doesn't check his value system; he responds to this basic position of humility. So you turn the other cheek and get hit again. Or you could have quite a superstitious resolution to this, if it carried conviction with it. You might have a person who genuinely believed (and there are many people that would believe this, I think; you can get examples from specific movements) that "I deeply know that on the seventh slap the earth opens up and this man is swallowed up;" there, secure in this knowledge, such a person could survive waiting for the seventh slap and the retribution to set in.

But I want to make the point that the choice of the examination of the

value system is quite arbitrary. I like it. What I agree with is that it is an expression of culture, which seems to me extremely important. The basic confusion is a semantic confusion. Sometimes I feel that I would like to be anti-semantic, but it's really always a semantic problem. There is always a basic confusion in this argument between free choice and freedom of movement or degrees of freedom. I would disagree that there's any more freedom, in the basic sense that you're talking about, in the person who's confronted in psychotherapy with life or death, let's say, or the person who is confronted in counseling with a choice of colleges. Now the response repertory is quite different, of course. In fact, you can't confuse degrees of freedom or freedom of movement or range of response repertory with choice and yet people fly back and forth rather easily between these two. I think that when someone talks about "freedom", you have to say, "What are you talking about? Are you talking about the number of potential responses that this person might make, or are you talking about the act of free choice?" These are very different.

Now, very briefly some efforts at solutions for this problem. William James was one of the most charming examples, you know. He, a product of training by Agassiz in medicine, believed in the 19th century determinism. But he didn't like it and, as a consequence, he had low back pains, and dizzy spells, and visual troubles, and so on. Then he went to France on one of his fifteen or sixteen voyages and he came across an essay by Renouvier on freedom of will. This was a great revelation to James and with his tremendous capacity for signaling to himself and other people, he agreed, he was converted. And he said, my first act of freedom of will, my first free act will be to choose and assert that man is free. And his back pains disappeared and he had about ten years of relative good health and happy activity.

Now Gordon Allport, who is very knowledgeable about the existential movement, quite aware, struggles with this problem very valiantly, but comes out with quite

a different position in his book Becoming. Just like all of us, he inherently as an individual rejects the deterministic position. I think this is universal among Americans. It is annoying and doesn't feel right. It just doesn't add up. So Allport joins us and says, it's wrong, and I don't like it. He has the metaphor of the man in a canoe going down a river around a bend, and he is free. He doesn't see the rock or the whirlpool that's around the bend, you see. Now Allport's metaphor gives out on him because he knows darn well that the rock is there. And so Allport finally ends up by saying, "Well, I don't like it but I don't know how I'm going to cope with the deterministic position which is ever so present."

George Kelly says -- George is so brilliant and writes so well -- he has a solution to the problem which says that once you get a construct system then the construct system determines everything in the domain of that construct, but you don't have to be caught with your construct. You can move to a higher level of construct. Now what George does not do is to explain the choice of moving to a higher level, you see; he's really caught in his own system. And then he re-defines the problem in terms of degrees of freedom and not in terms of basic choice, and feels he's solved it, and I argue with George every time I see him. I am completely convinced that he's wrong, and after two hours of talking with him, he's convinced me that he's right, you see, and it takes me a week to recuperate.

Let's take Arthur Compton now. People often argue that atomic physics has, with the work of Nils Bohr, Heisenberg, and so on, shattered the deterministic position. This is simply a misreading of them. Arthur Compton does this, and he is a tremendous man. His argument is that in microphysics you cannot predict the disintegration of particular molecules, or the path of a single molecule, therefore man is free and God exists. These are poor arguments for the freedom of man and the existence of God.

Now I'd like to make another, more essential, point that Fred Ginascot was trying to make the other day quite unsuccessfully, that there are two positions. One is the position that Rollo May and Father Van Kaam have presented, and these are internally consistent and eloquent and powerful and moving. The position of the determinist, Fred Skinner and others, is also internally consistent and powerful and moving, and there is no basis presented for choice between these two. Now actually the deterministic position is, from a logical viewpoint, a little bit more sanitary. There is a fatal weakness in the existential position, and that is that the residual iota of freedom left may be so small that it simply becomes a symbol, and in a pragmatic society won't make any difference. It may be a nice mirror, if you will, and that has certain self-defining properties that may be good, but pragmatically it may not be too helpful.

Now what is the possible resolution? Let me tell you where I have come from, my original position. Right now (if I feel the same way about it next year, I'll be disappointed in me) it seems to me that we have to say this is a policy issue. The cue that I got that led me to this line of thinking was the position that the law takes on the issue of freedom and responsibility. The law is quite arbitrary with respect to this issue, in its efforts to help society run itself. The law says that up until sixteen or fifteen you are not responsible; after that you are; as a juvenile or infant, society is responsible and then after a particular age you are responsible and free. Now the charming thing and wonderfully instructive thing about this is that this age even varies from state to state. So that in Kentucky at age fifteen you are free, and in Tennessee, let's say, you've got another year of grace before you are. This may be the very best way to run a country; it's good policy to have it this way.

Now in determining responsibility with respect to the issue of insanity, we've had the McNoughton rule, where, as I understand it, you have cognitive experts make the judgment that the man is insane or is not insane, and then quite

divergent consequences ensue from this. David Basiline, Judge Basiline, is not content with this kind of reliance entirely upon expert authority, and has a new rule now that's causing considerable dismay and distress and anxiety. The jury has to make up its own mind. You get all the experts you can, the experts testify but they don't determine whether it is or is not insanity; the jury is going to be the final criterion now of freedom and responsibility.

In one's personal life and running a family, it seems to me, that it's a very good policy -- and we all do it anyway -- to assume a rather unlimited freedom, particularly when you're well. When you're ill, you don't feel this way, but when you're well, you choose when to get up in the morning, and whether or not to shave, and you choose to come to a conference or not to come. Now this is probably a pretty good policy for running one's personal life.

On the other hand, the deterministic position may be the only position on which man can take a scientific stand at this time. I am worried about what seems to me to be a tendency on the part of men like Rollo May and Carl Rogers to make fun of this position. The work of such people as Skinner should be taken seriously, even while we recognize that it does not mean that the course of each individual life is predetermined.

As a policy position for education and counseling, the existentialist position can be a good one, but it can only be adopted for particular purposes. Whether or not you adopt it depends upon the hat you are wearing at the time, and on what you are planning and hoping to do. In summary, the age-old conflict between the existentialist and determinist positions is a problem which must be constantly re-resolved.

A. Van Kaam: I agree with Nick Hobbs's final statement, but I believe that the counselor must go beyond science. It is true that he needs a deep knowledge of all the determinants of behavior -- in order to be able to find ways of

circumventing them. The more we know about the determinants of behavior, the more we can transcend them -- and this is the mission of the counselor and of society -- to contribute to gains in freedom. Freedom is a tenuous possession, both for the individual and for society -- and, in the matter of freedom, the individual cannot go far beyond society.

Determinism is an acceptable assumption, so long as we view it as relative, rather than absolute. I agree with Nick Hobbs that, most certainly, cultural pressures influence the definition of "free" responses. I agree also that we have to work within the social system to expand our own and others' freedom. I agree with Solon Kimball that the concept of freedom is co-determined -- it is a function of culture and of the individual within the culture. If we are to counsel we must know the situation of the population with whom we are counseling.

I cannot agree, however, that the existentialist position is without scientific basis. Unfortunately, existentialist experimental research has been conducted chiefly in Europe and, until recently, the reports of such work have not been translated into English. If you would like to know more about this research, I would suggest that you read Maurice Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology of Perception and Strassman's Phenomenology of Human Sciences.

Finally, I feel that conversion -- that is, change -- brought about by counseling is authentic only if it occurs through the conscious participation of the individual; conversion or change, that is brought about through manipulation is not authentic.

S. Kimball: My position is one which says that commitment is a function of the society in which you find yourself -- even though its expression is found within the individual.

A. Van Kaam: In my view, commitment is always a function of the nature of society, but it is centered in the acts of the individual.

DISCUSSION

F. Ginascot: In my view, existentialism doesn't cut any ice, because it attempts to create a philosophy and a science in the image of a man.

S. Jourard: Nick Hobbs's view seems to me to be the pragmatic one and probably typically American. He says that the question is unanswerable. Is an unanswerable question existential?

I think we have to learn to live with such questions. Barron, in an article "Freedom as Healing" in a 1961 issue of the Journal of Humanistic Psychology, contrasts objective freedom and subjective freedom -- the latter is a feeling which can operate psychologically just as any other feeling. The guidance counselor, it seems to me, should be sensitive to the existence and the degree of this kind of feeling in the counselee -- and then help him assess his objective degrees of freedom.

Accepting the idea of freedom and responsibility is, in itself, a deterministic factor. What chinks we find in the system will depend on what we are.

G. Tanenbaum: Choice is always limited by the kinds of perceptions available in the environment.

R. Bain: Isn't it true that the feeling of freedom is possible only when there are conflicts in society that make choices possible?

I. Landsman: I would like to know more about existentialist science.

A. Van Kaam: The existentialist science is based on the assumption that, "I am a dialogue with the world, at all levels of my existence." This is a circular dialogue -- at all levels -- I to the world, the world to me, and so on.

The hypotheses studied in laboratory experiments are such questions as: Is man always trying to find meaning?, studied through isolation experiments; and, Is the body in a dialogue with the world?, studied through perception experiments.

W. Neff: Conceptual certainty and empirical certainty are two different things. In actuality, conceptual certainty is never obtainable; on conceptual issues, certainty is only a feeling.

One aspect of freedom can be empirically established -- for example, the complex development of the nervous system permits a repertory of responses, and freedom increases with the repertory of responses.

On the other hand, our techniques of thought are not yet adequate for achieving conceptual certainty. Our only modern innovation in the organization of thinking is in the control of empirical observations. So today we obtain knowledge not by reflection, as was the prevailing mode for many centuries, but by empirical observation.

M. Hamburger: It is important to remember that societies now give men a scope of freedom never known before, although many individuals may not be in a position to recognize the range of choices available to them. To me, existentialism seems to reflect the ideal of freedom of a simple agricultural society. I think we

have to redefine our concept of the individual in contemporary terms. The population explosion, technology, urbanization -- all have changed our concepts of freedom. Since we now have to work with people who have never had access to any real knowledge of their scope of freedom -- for example, many disadvantaged children in urban areas -- the issue seems to me to be not whether there should be intervention, but what kind of intervention?

M. Schwebel: In my view, it is the counselor's function to intervene to alter determining factors toward the end of gaining greater freedom for the counselee. The diagnostic categories for classifying these factors are those found within the individual, the necessary environmental controls, and the environmental barriers to freedom, where these are not necessary controls.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

IV

THE PROCESS OF INTERACTION
BETWEEN
BEHAVIORAL SCIENTISTS AND
COUNSELOR EDUCATORS

What happens at any conference and what may happen as a result of it is usually as much a function of the nature of interaction among the participants as of the content of the material discussed. This is particularly true of a conference such as this one, which was a deliberate effort to involve individuals from two different groups in joint enterprises.

Had time and funds been available, a group process analysis of the tape-recordings of the small and large group discussions at the conference would have been an interesting exercise. In order that the readers of this report may instead evaluate for themselves some of the quality of the interaction between the counselor educators and the behavioral scientists (or "social scientists", as they were more apt to call themselves and as they are, therefore, labeled in the following pages), including some semantic barriers between the two groups, certain contrasts in approaches to problem-solving and in conceptions the problem to be solved, and differences in tolerance of ambiguity and perceptions of what is ambiguous, this section of the report contains excerpts from these discussions.

The material is arranged in chronological order, beginning with excerpts from the small group discussions of the Project Scholars' papers on Monday and Tuesday, followed by excerpts from the separate meetings of the counselor educators and the social scientists on Wednesday morning, and concluding with the full transcript of the panel discussion by three counselor educators and three behavioral scientists on Wednesday afternoon and the group discussion which followed it.

A summary of the observations of the conference staff concerning the nature of the interaction process and some of its implications is contained in the final section of this report.

SOME FACETS OF THE PROCESS OF INTERACTION
BETWEEN COUNSELOR EDUCATORS AND SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

Excerpts from the Small Group Discussions
Monday and Tuesday, January 7 and 8

What is Guidance and What are its Researchable Problems?

Counselor Educator: Our reaction can be I suppose to either Rollo May's paper or his presentation this morning. We would want to try to work out some reaction of our own that would take us even further forward in the direction of frontier thinking although maybe some of you share with me the feeling that if I get much further out I'm going to fall.

Social Scientist: But I think I was fundamentally disturbed with two things, one in May's use of the term, therapy, and the term, guidance. I don't know if he's using these in the same meaning, in the same context, that is, with the same definition, or whether he means they should be separate. When he talked about therapy and guidance, he said the key to it is intuition. Well, this was sort of like waving a red flag in front of me. This bothers me. Is this some god-given thing? What does he mean when he says intuition? Is this a word to just bounce around in the field of guidance and therapy, or does it have a real concrete, firm meaning?

The second point that bothered me was it seemed that what he was saying was probably of considerable value to the professional counselor at the teaching level, such as Bill is here, or to the director of a program, but if I understand the fundamental meaning of this conference, it is to try to get something down to the people who actually do the bulk of the counseling or advising or whatever it is in the secondary and elementary school and at the college level. To be a professional therapist is one thing, but to teach courses in the university to prospective high school guidance people, if this is the right term, seems to me to be quite different. I don't think you can expect the little high school people or the colored university people to do more than advising, to be highly developed professionalized therapists.

As guidance people, do we shape lives? If this is what guidance people are intending to do, then I'd like to take issue with the whole guidance fraternity on the question of shape. If they're talking in terms of a broad frame of reference which I'm inclined to think certainly they are, I believe that I understand roughly what we mean when we talk about guidance, but I must have some clearer definition of the term insight and the term intuition before I'd know where to go. What in the world would I tell, let's say, the young staff member who is going out into the public schools of Seattle? Will I say, now this depends upon your intuition? I think that this is the height of the ridiculous.

Soc. Sc.: Therefore, what meaning can this have if he stands up before a class of Master's candidates or the level of counseling on which Bill is running his program out at Washington State, and he uses this term, what are they going to do, go home and pray they have it?

Soc. Sc.: At some point, I hope that you guidance trainers can define for us what the basic operations for guidance are as you see them, so that we can get into the basic operations for guidance are as you see them, so that we can get into the frame of reference for further discussion.

Soc. Sc.: I'd like for someone in the social sciences to make the expression of what we conceive that we might contribute to it, and I want to be specific about it. I don't want to talk about a lot of darn generalizations again, but be specific.

Soc.Sc.: I share your feeling that research here at this conference is used as a pretty broad term. It involves also curriculum innovation, involves the rearrangement of content, and things of this nature, and their evaluation.

Couns. Ed.: Two questions: first, what should we be doing in guidance? -- and only after that, what has May to contribute to this goal, when it is determined?

Soc. Sc.: First we could say, what do we do now? and then How can May contribute to this?

Research might deal with identifying basic views of man held by counselor and counselee.

Couns.Ed: Right now I guess we're supposed to develop a couple of questions and go back to Rollo May and if we come with a damned good question that we're agreed upon and that runs away with us we're supposed to write this question down on a sheet and then we go back to Rollo May.

Couns. Ed.: Suppose we ask or address ourselves to this as a problem. I would hope that we do not necessarily limit ourselves to discussion either to the May paper or to all of the papers. I'm interested in where other people are on the frontier of research and what comes next in some kind of development of ideas round about this. I'm interested in what some of the implications are for my own training program and how it might be improved. These sort of fit the kind of questions which Esther Lloyd-Jones has for the conference: What exists that we ought to bring into practice? How can you help in training? and What are some of the research ideas with which we as research partners itch which can be facilitated by collaborative endeavor? This is the first opportunity some of us had had to swap ideas about this.

Couns. Ed.: I've been wishing that, to balance or to vitalize, maybe, the use of these scholars, someone would make a list of what seemed to be the acute problems in the field of guidance, whether it is in practice or training, so that we can think of the theoretical formulations which we have been given by the scholars in some sort of context.

For example, for me it's unclear as to what is meant by "guidance" by the four scholars. I suspect from the little bit of chatting that I've done that there is among them a differing concept of what it is.

Another question that I always raise in connection with any scheme of counseling, interviews, and so on, is the extent to which making the structure or the conditions for operating your guidance program is governed by the same principles you use in dealing with the counselee. This comes to my mind in connection with something that Gummere was talking about this morning -- the amount of suspicion and dislike of guidance counselors that one encounters in the schools. What immediately came into my mind were two things. First it seems to me that we have created in the modern school a situation in which the teacher is pretty well prevented from knowing the student and in which the kind of guidance and counseling that would occur normally in the process of work has now to take place in a different kind of situation. I'm thinking of work in a rural school in Georgia in which all this happened as part of one matrix, not divided off as you are in contemporary urban or suburban schools. It seems to me, first you've created a condition, and then you have to hire guidance counselors to remedy, to salvage, if you can, those things which you've lost through the creation of this

condition. When I said this to Dick he said maybe that explains why teachers look at us the way they do. But he hadn't thought, as I have, of how the principal or superintendent will often consider the guidance person a kind of witch doctor type or something which he doesn't fully understand and which he is kind of disturbed about.

I guess the word context is central to what I'm trying to talk about. It seems to me guidance or counseling takes place in a context, and the problems, neurotic or otherwise, arise from the context. What did Rollo May tell us that applies to any part of this?

Couns.Ed.: The need to get some kind of sanction for the kind of services we offer is one of our basic problems and I'm concerned that I'm a little bit worried that this conference is not going to be really sane.

Soc.Sc.: Here's a new profession struggling for some sense of identity. I don't see that we are reaching any resolution of what the counselor's role really is or should be.

Soc. Sc.: It seems to me though, that the kind of general problems, that May and others raise, are relevant to the definition of a role because in most bureaucratic structures a role becomes a kind of arbitrary thing. There is a lot of "make-work" and a lot of formal structure. How is the counselor supposed to know what his role is until he has some concept of what are the goals of the institutions he is in, and what they should be. I see the conflict as contributing tremendously in this respect.

Soc. Sc.: In this role definition one of the major attributes is going to be the setting of some kind of end state. What the counselor has to face is whether he is a kind of psychological arm of the system, who adjusts the parts using various techniques, or does he stand against the current, does he ask for an evaluation of what we're getting at out of four years of high school or thirteen years of school, etc. As a social scientist, it seems to me he shouldn't set goals but can insist on a discussion for a clarification of goals and the process by which they might be obtained.

Couns.Ed.: I must get down to specifics at this point. Bob and I have been toying around with an idea. You take a young Negro who may have all the attributes for achievement and because of many conditions in his environment etc., he can't really develop his potentialities. This is the kind of problem it seems to me which is really central to what the counselor should be doing. It's one thing to have a person who comes to you all confused, highly motivated to resolve his difficulties; it's another thing to go out, as a counselor, and systematically create anxiety. This is where I get over a barrel in trying to help the counselor choose his role. Should he go out and aggressively do something about this?-- to help these young kids to develop skills with which they can really develop their latent potential? If I'm talking only about therapy, I have no conflict, for then he applies to me for help.

Couns. Ed.: It seems to me we are awfully good in schools in intimidating people rather than in giving them some kind of experience that results in self confidence, courage, the willingness to gamble. That's one of the specific things which then leads to another. Should the guidance counselor work with teachers and thus multiply, hopefully, the benefits that would come if his influence were shared by the teachers? I suspect, in turn, that that couldn't happen if the principal were scared of him, wanted to keep him in "his place."

Soc. Sc.: I'd like to know whether or not the guidance counselor trainers would like to elaborate on the definition of the goals for guidance as being to help adolescents and preadolescents make decisions?

Couns.Ed.: I'd rather put it another way, to provide the environment to make the best possible decisions themselves.

Consulting Scholar: Is guidance supposedly different from therapy or counseling?

Couns.Ed.: Many of the problems that kids encounter simply in growing and adjusting don't require therapy, and if guidance people and teachers are prepared to meet these in a realistic and productive sort of way - rather than passing them on to therapists, I think we'd be making much more progress that way.

Couns.Ed.: This conference itself indicates a growing concern about guidance, particularly in an educational setting. We're going through quite a self analysis; we've been plagued with many problems in developing guidance services and counseling services in our schools. Several things are happening. One is that the American Personnel and Guidance Association is developing a policy statement in respect to this role function. The American School Counselors' Association which is a division of APGA is looking at the role-function-conditioned work of the school counselor, trying to get some common bases of understanding. One big problem we face in school counseling today is a lack of adequate supervision. We may have the best prepared school counselor in the United States, but if he's supervised by the assistant principal in charge of transportation, well, he's not going to have the opportunity to do many of the things that he'd like to do.

There is another problem, too. The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, another division of APGA, has a five year study under way of counselor education standards, and one of the real problems we face is that there are today officially on record in the U.S. Office of Education some 600 institutions of higher learning in the United States that have presidents, have deans, and have people in charge of counseling, who have indicated that they have the resources, staff, facilities to prepare counselors. Well, about 15 or 20 of us sat around in a hotel room in Chicago, people who know the country pretty well, and we agreed that there might be between 30 and 60 institutions of higher learning that have the staff, resources, facilities to prepare counselors. There needs to be a change in emphasis in counselor preparation and one of these is in the area of theoretical bases. The school counselor has been too technique-oriented, and we've been guilty. There is perhaps a content to form a theoretical basis for school guidance and counselor education, but we've never assimilated this content. We've been guilty of snatching a little psychology and a little anthropology and a person doesn't have any structured theoretical basis.

Another area is an emphasis on the facilitation of self understanding. In other words, we have not been conscious of the internal forces or dynamics. We deal too much with external forces surrounding the child.

Another is that we need a greater emphasis on the positive aspects of behavior. We have had too much emphasis on the negative aspects of behavior, and I think, if I read Kagan correctly, perhaps he's concerned, as you say, about the possibility not of corrective procedures so much as preventive. These are some of the basic problems, as I see it, that we face in counselor preparation.

Soc. Sc.: The concept of counselor varies considerably from place to place.

Soc. Sc.: I would rather have the question answered at this point in terms of what should a guidance counselor be as the leaders in the field see it, rather than what is being done?

Couns.Ed.: I think we begin to see more and more in counselor education, the

need for the schools to be organized in a way that the kinds of competence is that the well prepared counselor might have could be utilized in the lives of children and youth. Another area that's of concern to us is not only how the school counselor might be utilized as a medium through which we might facilitate growth and understanding on the part of pupils, but also, what opportunities are there for the counselor and the teacher both to grow professionally through mutual exchange of ideas -- the consulting role of the counselor. And here again we need considerable structure, you see; this role has not been structured.

Couns.Ed.: May I put my two cents in? I would like to extend a little further the remark that Jerry made about the fact that we simply don't have and won't have the child therapists, the psychiatrists, the psychologists for decades to come, if ever, to deal with these problems. I'd like to add that in reality, we're not going to have the guidance counselors, either to deal with the kind of problems he speaks of, especially when he speaks of a person who will be nearly as well trained as the Ph.D. in psychology, nearly as well trained in terms of two years beyond the bachelor's degree as a minimum, and this surely will include either the minimum of internship or a very intensive supervised experience in working with kids.

Couns.Ed.: I believe the difficulties are that the kind of people who will be willing to go through this kind of education will be those who find incentives for this. Usually this will mean higher salaries than they are getting now as counselors; it will mean competing with clinical psychology and counseling psychology, if there will really be any difference at that point in candidates.

Couns.Ed.: I think we could win hands down if we gave clinical-type training and there was an understanding that it was respectable.

Soc. Sc.: This means then that schools would be in a position to have lines in the budget for salaries.

Couns.Ed.: This is already true in our area. 8-9 thousand dollars is no problem.

Soc. Sc.: With two years training the school psychologist is making what?

Couns.Ed.: Ten, eleven.

Couns.Ed.: What is your definition of clinical, Dave?

Con. Sch.: For me clinical means somebody who establishes himself at a point where judgment is emphasized and approaches the cases that appear at this point in a problem solving way, exercising this judgment to control the flow so something desirable occurs. In this sense, the teacher is a clinician, also a parent; I consider this to be one of the tasks the kids ought to take up to learn how to be a clinician themselves.

Soc. Sc.: Does this definition limit the work of the clinician to working with individuals?

Con. Sch.: No, but it limits him to working with problems.

Couns.Ed.: The prevention of problems?

Con. Sch.: If it's a problem, then it's got to be solved.

Couns. Ed.: How about the prevention of problems that have not yet arisen?

Con. Sch.: The prevention of presumed future difficulties.

Couns. Ed.: The teachers have been trying to do both, teaching and counseling. What's most intriguing to do is to be a counselor. One of the things that is occurring is that we have uneasy teachers in the school. They are damn hard to push over as far as counseling is concerned.

Con. Sch.: I would have agreed with you, I believe, a short while ago but I've had some experiences at school of helping counselors learn to work with a large share of teachers that has made me change my mind. I'm wondering really if the role of the counselor in a few years may not be working indirectly with students through teachers.

Couns. Ed.: This can't happen as long as the teacher remains the king of the elementary school classroom.

Couns. Ed.: As long as your contact with the pupil has to be through the teacher at all times then you are only going to be a technician. If you get involved with the teacher, for the education of Johnny and Susie, etc., and your neck is out if things go wrong, and you have some of the authority to modify the teaching technique, then you've the opportunity to work as a real professional with this teacher, rather than as a technician or a consultant of the teacher for the pupil. If you want to insure liberation in education to all, you've got to put the function and responsibility and authority in the school organization that can give it.

Soc. Sc.: I don't see anything inherent in education that cripples the child's freedom; I do see it present in much of our education -- the tendency to cripple children, the tendency to inhibit self-decision, and independence, judgment, etc., but I don't see anything inherent in the educational process itself that it need be so. I don't feel that we need psychologists or therapists or guidance counselors to correct this. What we need are certain fundamental changes in our schools.

The Education of Counselors

Soc. Sc.: In studying the primitive society form, the anthropologist's approach to culture, it's been my observation that in the so-called rites of passage ceremony we seem to be exactly in the reverse of the positions of the primitive society in bringing young persons through the rites of passage. It's been my observation (although it may be an incorrect one) that we try to force out and determine for the child and the young adult when and how he should go through the rites of passage. Certainly I agree that we should set the form the ritual, but we should not be the ones that decide for the youngster when he does it. Let him have more freedom in the decision of when. I noticed among the people in Zulaland and others that the child himself pushed toward this, and he made every effort to push toward it. He was ever wanting the approbation of the elder to say, "I'm ready. Don't you think I'm ready?" He was working toward this, and he fought to understand the nature of adult behavior. I think in our culture I've observed the reverse -- that the adult presses the youngsters on -- "You should decide your major." You should decide what you are going to do."

Soc. Sc.: "When are you going to grow up?"

Couns.Ed.: I think this question is particularly relevant to guidance people. Guidance counselors are trying to move away from this business of enforcing points of decision, forcing the student to choose black and white along the way, trying instead to help them to take their time about it, to take a moment to think through it.

Couns.Ed.: Isn't there some evidence in the literature that social sensitivity develops rather late -- maybe in the late teens or the early twenties? This is a region of activity of which a lot of people say, "Well, I went into education as a last resort." They create a false impression perhaps -- "He floundered all over the campus, he tried engineering, he tried everything else, now look at him; he's gone over to education. And there must not be much of a college over there, because he's making good grades." I think there must be some support for the concept that the social sensitivity develops rather late and it's not until the sophomore year in college, or maybe the junior year, that a person decides that he wants to be a teacher, or he wants to be a minister, or similar social roles. Isn't this one reason we need not to push students too hard to choose long-range goals?

Con. Sch.: I think that is especially dangerous when you apply the rites of passages of tribes to our culture, where there are a wide variety of personality possibilities. The tribe is far more fixed in its common way.

Couns.Ed.: I am concerned about the statement that perception is culturally determined. I would argue that cognition is culturally determined, but that perception probably not.

Con. Sch.: I think that cognition and perception are strongly interwoven. You can put the emphasis on the cognitive or the perceptive aspect, but they really cannot be separated in reality. In other words, my cognition changes at the very moment of perception, and this is what we call a circular relationship.

Couns.Ed.: Is the implication of Kimball's idea, in terms of training counselors, that we would have to train them as perceptive anthropological observers as well as training them in the other kinds of things that we do?

Couns.Ed.: Does it mean that we should have a trained anthropologist on every one of our guidance teams?

Soc. Sc.: If I were translating this for you back on the home campus, I would hope that all of your people that are going into guidance would take the course that we call "Culture and Personality." in anthropology because it centers not so much on technique but as on the development and the understanding of the relationship of personality and culture. He was referring to research technique in the sense that the anthropologist, and I will include the sociologist too, might contribute something from our studies to you as a specialized group, that is, for you and other counselors or people that are running a counseling system that might be valuable to you for translating into education itself.

Couns.Ed.: Well, my feeling is for a guidance person to become expert in any given school situation; he could very well rely on some of this participant observer skill in finding some of the important factors to study within a situation, in order to be able to be of best service to the students who come through that system.. He should know the system pretty well and know the limitations

and opportunities.

Soc. Sc.: I would say if I had to determine what I thought the guidance person as an undergraduate, hoping to become a guidance person, that is, should take, Mac, in sociology and anthropology, I would set two courses. Now these courses would have to be taught with education people in view. I'd suggest they'd take the sociology course we call "Community Organization". I'd say the second one in anthropology is "Personality and Culture".

The Problems of Group Process

Couns.Ed.: What frequently happens at meetings is, as I've been observing, that you can consume two hours of meetings arguing like hell what the next step ought to be or what the goal of the next step ought to be. Then you suddenly find that there is one-half hour of time left for consideration of the means by which to get there. I frequently ask myself, "Is this bad?" Then I pull myself up and say, "Maybe it isn't." It seems to me that if people have understanding of the ambiguities, then they have understanding of some of the alternatives favored by one and not by another, even though the coalition in general have agreed on some, one alternative and they then have the power to make adaptations of the means in relation to the specific instances which are unfolding as they undertake the actions.

Soc. Sc.: Are you speaking of goals in terms of a profession, in terms of an individual, in terms of an institution?

Couns.Ed.: Any and all of these.

Couns.Ed.: Will you clarify for me the relationship between the status problem and goals?

Soc. Sc.: Yes. I watch this on psychiatric teams. Some of them work very beautifully. It seems to me in these cases the people were patient-oriented and they were all sitting around the table saying to themselves, "How are we going to help this guy?" In other instances they were clearly saying to themselves, "What's my job, what am I supposed to do, what's his diagnostic category for the record?" Here there was a clear kind of friction in terms of everybody being very careful that he didn't do what the psychologist should do, or psychologists fighting with the psychiatrists, with the social workers mediating like mama. Teams that were task-oriented were fun. You looked forward to going to them; you were really doing a job. You would say: There's something we can do. In the other instance, we said, "We've just got to leave this situation as it is." "Next case." I think the key word in all this is "careful." When people become careful with one another, then you begin to notice that there is no actual interchange.

Soc. Sc.: I get disturbed with group process for the sake of group process; this is the kind of contemplating the group navel that bothers me; it's almost indecent.

Soc. Sc.: I too find that process for its own sake is nothing. However, I think that some of the dicta of group process can increase group power. One of them I would say is: let's leave the problem of deciding on a purpose with the group

to the extent that the group agrees it should be theirs. Another one, I think, is that you must tend to gain acceptance of the members, but a problem arises when you seek acceptance independent of quality and this dialectic between acceptance and quality is for me the definition of the task of a leader in some groups. If we consider acceptance independently of quality we eliminate the quality and then we get pure process. To have pure quality without acceptance is to have a goal without membership. This is the price you pay. These are the limits you try to move down in clinical operation and group management.

Couns.Ed.: I go to lots of meetings where you get various disciplines together and they spend all the time trying to decide whose function is what, and they never get any work done, and yet I see this as a major problem of counselors, in the educational setting. Some of their anxieties arise because they have no clear perception of their status within the system, they are not administrators, yet they are perceived partly as administrators.

The Role and Function of the Guidance Worker

Couns.Ed.: What truly is our function now? What ought it to be? It is at this point at which I am sharply at variance with some other counselor educators here. I think some of the differences in our viewpoints yesterday afternoon really represent a difference in the definition of goals and functions of the counselor. Now if we, here, who are educating counselors, have some divergent views, what can we expect of the counselors?

Couns.Ed.: I don't accept that question because I think there's death in that question. Forgive me for saying this but you see the consequences of it is to 'never do anything until we know', and also to suffer from the "king-like" tradition that we can know and then pass our knowledge on to a younger generation. To me the critical problem is to make sure that the counselor has a purpose when he leaves us.

Couns.Ed.: I'm of the opinion that necessarily we influence, if by no other means than by the model we give. Your orientation, my orientation are bound to have their impacts upon our students respectively.

Couns.Ed.: For me the problem is to go ahead in our tentativeness and knowledgeable ignorance, trusting in the students to define the job. And I would define it ever higher in the hierarchy of the school. I think you crack the responsibility and authority problems in the school organization; otherwise we're going to be the servants of, rather than the colleagues of, the teacher in the educative process.

Soc.Sc.: I think you've just defined two goals and I think that the strength of the enterprise is related to whether the assumptions from which it proceeds are conscious enough to be examined. To me, you are really not fighting with each other. You both, I think, may have a different interpretation of what some words mean. One of the goals that you just stated was to get the student in training to define for himself his goals. This is your goal and you know it. I find myself at a considerable loss here because I don't know what a guidance counselor is. This is directly related to everything that's been said so far. Perhaps I could ask you two or three questions out of my ignorance which you might answer quickly. Does a guidance counselor counsel and guide? If so, what is the nature of the counseling and what is the nature of the guidance?

Couns.Ed.: Notice those pauses after you speak. This is the very problem that I'm confronting. I don't know that I can answer your question.

Soc. Sc.: Second, in what context does guidance counseling take place? Third, with what goals or assumptions? And fourth, with what problems? Yesterday, I suggested that it would be enormously helpful even if you didn't answer any of the other questions, if you would tell me quickly what are a dozen of the common problems in guidance. Without knowing answers to those questions, it is very difficult for me to think in terms of what this conference is set up for and to say what I think the ideas of the speakers can mean. I might go on to indicate that what we got was a significant emphasis from Kimball on the extent to which the structure or the system in which you are working, or the context, to use my words, allows participation. I would say that omitted from what he said was the statement that I assumed to lie back of it - that what we want is to release and develop the full potential of the people we are concerned about - students, teachers, administrators. Some of the things that were omitted, as I saw it, which it seems to me we need to consider also, are how are functions managed from place to place, in different cultures? This, to me, is a contribution of anthropology to the thinking of everybody who's concerned with human development. For example, Robert Redfield's concern is with human values. You may have seen the little piece he wrote a couple of years ago, which he calls "Conversation with a Stranger" in which he raises the question of whether it's more important to look at the moon or to hit it. He relates his concern about values to 'forces', which is a term I would prefer to use rather than to limit myself to 'culture patterns' as Benedict does. I would prefer to see us concerned about all of the field of forces which operate. Some of these come from individuals, as I see it, and some come from the natural environment and some come from the social environment - Malinowski's emphasis on context and meaning, Korybsky's work, which is certainly germane to a great deal that was classical in anthropology, and all the implications of his general theory of semantics. These are things which I believe have thus and thus implications for training guidance counselors if we knew what a guidance counselor was, so I come back to my question.

Couns.Ed.: Perhaps we don't want to define this too clearly.

Couns.Ed.: I'm willing to accept defining what I think he might do, as long as we understand that we thereby remove from the students who come to us the problem of taking on a goal.

Soc. Sc.: I couldn't agree more with you about being sure that the student coming along has to wrestle with this, but again let me say that I think that in itself is a goal for guidance training.

Couns.Ed.: But the group here last night couldn't agree on this. For example, Arbuckle sees this as sort of setting up clinics within schools, maybe not that formal a structure, but working with seriously disturbed youngsters who come to your office for counseling. I think this is a very minor part of the role of the counselor. As I see it, most of the guidance worker's concern is with all youngsters, all kinds of problems and growth experiences that they are having.

Couns.Ed.: On Long Island, in the suburban schools, a counselor will have assigned to him somewhere between 300 and 400 students on the junior and senior high school level. This counselor usually will see all the students at least once during the year. Every youngster should be seen at least once for the purpose of helping that youngster plan his program for the following year.

This interview might last anywhere from 10 minutes to 30-35 minutes and might be followed up by another one if the student shows signs of indecision, or if the student's performance is such that there is a question about his being able to go on with the program. And then the counselor sees those students who are failing, about whom there is some question as to cause. But the counselor is usually not equipped to determine the cause of failure, except on the most superficial basis - "His I.Q. is too low." Then the counselor will see students who are "underachieving" and this is particularly true in suburban schools where the parent and the child desire college and the performance of the child is such that he'll have difficulty or he'll have to go somewhere South, or he won't be able to go to the colleges the community values highly.

Then of course the counselor will see students who are disruptive - not so much the child who has the kind of mental health problem that leads to withdrawn behavior, although this will happen sometimes with a sensitive counselor, but more likely those who are aggressive, pre-delinquent youngsters, or the occasional case of a pregnant girl, the fellow who gets involved with the law, and similar behavioral disorders in school.

The counselor will engage in group orientation practices in the junior high level, 7th grade or so, group guidance of an educational or occupational nature, maybe two or three periods a week. I don't recall now what the typical situation would be. The high school counselor, particularly the senior class counselor will be engaged almost full time in helping the senior in getting into college, if they want to go, including visiting colleges, being a good public relations man and reminding such and such good colleges "don't forget to think of us", and building up good relationships so that there will be trust in the recommendations of the counselor.

In New York City particularly, in the areas with which we are familiar like Bedford-Stuyvesant area and the Harlem area, the guidance function is in some ways an adjunct to the police force. I don't mean this disrespectfully, simply the job is one of trying to reduce the drop-out rate and trying to maintain some semblance of order in the classroom, working usually with youngsters whom the guidance counselor tends to have difficulty in comprehending and with whom there is a sharp clash of values. This is at least what I know to be true in the metropolitan area.

Soc. Sc.: A part of the dialectic around this table then is this: it's a matter of record that this is so.

Couns. Ed.: The kind of differences which exist here come from my unwillingness to accept that what is is the best, rather than trying to think what might be better and to attack the existing situation in terms of change which would be needed. From this orientation, if we understood it this way, I'd be glad to talk to the four areas of questions but I would say, first that for me it is very important to have a word which is different from the person or any one of the functions which he may serve. This word I take as "guidance". Secondly, it is important to deal with this word in relation to education, which is the context which I accept for the operation of my function. One of the problems is that I don't think there is unanimity on accepting the educational context among those people who call themselves counseling psychologists. For me it is a limit I'm willing to accept when I speak of guidance. I try to speak of guidance with relation to the meeting of a youngster with his destiny through organized education. I then need a paradigm - a guidance person who tends to talk about the problem, giving the youngster a problem which is advocated by adults, while at the same time the youngster is given the freedom and problem of taking on goals.

and of becoming expert in the applied science of the art of living. I think it very necessary for the context to be organized so that both of these functions are present, both of these functions must collaborate and the child should be in a position of using them as resources - not being swayed, but not being subject to the ultimate authority of either, in the sense of having others take up his life problems for him.

The fact is that when I use guidance I want to use it in the context of "life," and I mean by this "birth to death." And I furthermore then want to limit in that general context the context of becoming through education so that I position the activities relating to getting this liberation in educational institutions, kindergartens, elementary schools, secondary schools, colleges, educational endeavors in industry or with the handicapped, or what have you. The goals are assumptions. In my paradigm of the content and the process, interested professionals are assigned responsibility for both. The one trouble is, of course, that you can't do this problem of process in a technical way. Another one is, you can talk about it in parts but it has to exist completely. You've got to recognize when you try to talk about it in parts that you are conceptualizing and not actually dealing with the full essence. The third one is that you've got to recognize that some people may do this better than others, but the fact that they do it better than others does not excuse anyone from attempting it. In general, from this paradigm you can then talk of a lot of the problems which are problems of non-unanimity among us. Some of us are pressing partially towards some of this ideal condition which I spoke of. Others are using what I consider to be temporary restraints on the situation rather than necessary ones - like the lack of competence; like what exists in behavioral sciences at the present time that we should be using - what exists is going to be in books or in people, I think, and I'm supposed to be in touch with it.

Soc. Sc.: Do you think you can do what you have so eloquently advocated and deal with 300 or 400 students on what their programs should be next year?

Couns.Ed.: Now you're talking about the organizational implementation of my ideals. I would say I need a staff; I would say the top man of the staff has to be assistant superintendent or dean, or the guy who dispenses the resources of the organization for this purpose. Under him he's got to have some people some of whom are psychologists, others who are social workers, others who are counselors. The resources of this organization have to be dispersed. Notice when I say this, I'm meeting Milt's existing organization. In this I would try to request enough resources so that a single counselor didn't have to see 350 people. I would say maybe 150 would be enough. Or maybe that's too many.

Couns.Ed.: To look at this in a different way not only from what is the status is now but from what I see emerging, I see what to me are some rather interesting things occurring. I see a counselor getting out from behind the desk; getting out in the community to take a team of 40 or 50 kids up in the High Sierras in the summer. I see another counselor taking the reams of tests we give, somehow pulling these down and analyzing them in the front of the folder to make sure that, when a teacher opens up that folder, that she's got some kind of reference with which to examine the tests - for example, kids with profiles which look something like this typically make these kinds of decisions. I see other counselors starting to get very deeply involved in discipline so that when a youngster leaves the school because he's been suspended for a few weeks, the counselor and the school environment are involved in helping him make plans about how he will relate to the fellows when he gets back to school. I must say I see these kinds of encouraging signs.

Couns. Ed.: I see another function emerging. This is where the counselor gets involved in managing the learning environment for his students. I'll give you a very concrete example. The English faculty in one high school got the bug to make it an academic school. If you couldn't learn, you went in the non-learners. It just so happened in one group that they were sectioning off as a non-learning group, the lowest score on a test (the CTMA or something like that) was an I.Q. of 120 and scores went up to 145. So the counselor was in the position of asking these teachers - do you mean you can't teach these kids English? Well, there is this kind of thing - how far do we go in this kind of endeavor?

Couns. Ed.: This may be a function of the counselor: the questions are what does the culture want? what is happening in it? what's happening to the kids? To what extent does the program relate to curriculum, relate to the fate of these kids? This is something that the chemistry instructor may not worry too much about. The guidance counselor may not be able to influence the social structure but his awareness of the way the world works contributes to his possible awareness of the potential fate of these kids.

Soc. Sc.: Every word that you two fellows have just said strengthens my conviction that I expressed yesterday morning that what educators do is to create a situation which is hostile to full development, then they hire somebody called a guidance counselor to come in and pick up the pieces if he can.

Couns. Ed.: Exactly. Someone, I don't remember who it was, quoted an educator who said, "The guidance counselor is the sewer man." He's at the end of the sewer or the cesspool and what he gets is the waste matter excreted by our educational system. By which neither he nor I mean to attribute any blame to individual teachers or schools. So my orientation became problem-oriented in the sense of what are the origins of these many problems that represent the sewers. How do they come about? What can we do, or some profession do, in order to deal with the cause, to eliminate this? Maybe I don't belong in guidance; maybe I belong in some other field of education, perhaps educational psychology.

Couns. Ed.: I see the problems of involvement in an educational experience for a large number of children over and beyond the Negro children in America - the Puerto Rican, the Mexicans, many large numbers of white disadvantaged children who reach a certain point, let us say, age 10 or so. I mention 10 since Jerry Kagan referred to 10 or 8 as crucial times; they may then reach a point where they are no longer free to make decisions. Perhaps their condition is irreversible. They have no opportunity to make decisions freely unless at age 3 and 4 and 5 and particularly in 1st 2nd or 3rd grade, someone in the school system provides them with a vastly different kind of experience than they usually have.

Couns. Ed.: I think it's a central behavioral science interest of guidance, of when you introduce opportunity and how often, etc. It's for me a necessary question in process.

The Place of the Counseling Function in the Educational System

Soc. Sc.: Do you disagree with Cowley's point of counseling as a complementary function as opposed to primary function?

Couns.Ed.: I don't think I do, but I wish he would spell it out a little in terms of how the counseling helps the student then to make better use of the teaching that's provided, or some little rationale.

Soc. Sc.: The question is, what is the rationale for assigning a given activity to either a primary function or a complementary function?

Soc. Sc.: No, that's not the question. The question really is, how do you decide which functions should be among the complementary functions of the university?

Couns.Ed.: There's a big fight now, essentially in psychology, whether training clinical psychologists ought to be in the regular academic department, and there's an argument that it shouldn't be.

Couns.Ed.: There's even a notion that there should be a different degree.

Couns.Ed.: A doctor of applied psychology. There's some argument that there are the schools of engineering and dentistry and social work, so what's wrong with the idea of a department of applied psychology and some people even say, put personnel training and industrial psychology, all the applied aspects over there and get them a dean or a head of it because, the people in the academic departments say, we want to turn out research people and teachers. But it's a very hard situation. In our department, for instance, United States Public Health Service kicks in about \$65,000 a year, and the dean and chairman do not want to let go of this.

Soc. Sc.: This is what bothers the academic psychologist, you see. They've gotten to the point where the clinicians are the tail that wags the dog.

Couns.Ed.: So let's say, the dog would like to cut off his tail, but it entails just too much money.

Couns.Ed.: It's sort of like having a rich but embarrassingly vulgar uncle. Many professors are paid out of public health funds, and those poor professors are doing a hell of a lot of teaching and some of it in areas like personality and child development that are only related to clinical. The dog may be unhappy but he can't cut off his tail to spite himself.

Couns.Ed.: Absolutely. The psychology department is constantly going through this struggle, but the problem exists in practically all of the social science departments. They're in community development, agricultural cooperative extension or in labor industrial relations or in education or someplace. The boys in labor industrial relations periodically say, for example, we got to do something to purify and get rid of all this proliferation and all these really nonrespectable sociologists that are over here in community development and education or extension. But see, here's the thing I'd like to ask Cowley, and I don't know whether I can phrase it right: what historical antecedents are there for the apparent situation that the more useful a given study is, the less respected it is among academic teachers?

Control of Standards for Counselor Education

Couns. Ed.: The APGA is doing a five-year study of counselor education standards - an attempt to develop standards. Now the question is who sets these standards (because the Counseling Psychology Division of APA has been proposing standards too) and who applies them?

Couns. Ed.: In the state of Washington two people are involved in the ASCA study. We also have a state certification committee which is conducting a survey. We also have the Washington State Personnel and Guidance Association which has a certification committee. We've got division chairmen all over the state, and we're doing the same darn thing. Consequently everybody is going around asking all the counselors what they think ought to be in the counselor education program. Now this is kind of like asking English teachers in high school or elementary school, what do you think we ought to teach in English.

Couns. Ed.: Everybody can bustle around all he wants to about counselor education, but in the final analysis counselor education people are going to have to decide what's going to be the content of the counselor education program.

Research

Soc. Sc.: Bill, this needs to be said I hope we don't suffer from the thought that we have to have research hypotheses here. God damn it the development of research hypotheses is a lonely task. I don't say this for not wanting to share. I'm dropping my ideals all over the place, but don't anyone ask me to put them in the research hypotheses.

Couns. Ed.: I think that Lloyd-Jones and the group assume that it'll come out of it by Thursday noon - that there will be some further ideas dropped here and there. The hope is that the team as it goes back to their institutions will have the basis for working together on some hypotheses.

Couns. Ed.: Mr. Chairman, may I propose a resolution. I propose that the counselor educators ask the behavioral scientists to teach us about fluid inquiry. If they will write this into one of their courses I will take it.

Soc. Sc.: My hypothesis, which I am never going to write down, is that the present thesis requirement system as it is administered is stultifying the development of inquiry and the creative mind. This will apply also to the use of it by counseling and guidance departments.

Soc. Sc.: I see that as at least one little possibility. You might extend that inquiry to the whole graduate education program.

Couns. Ed.: Actually this would apply to the whole school of education.

Couns. Ed.: I want to find the factors that lead to either productive scholarship or the reverse.

Soc. Sc.: The only index you'll have of that is publication, ordinarily.

Couns. Ed.: In my study, unless the committee changes it, I would want to

include other uses of research, some of which might be extremely important in my opinion. For example, I believe that the reason we don't want to be called educationists or educators is related to the fact that the liberal arts and the so-called disciplines look down their noses at us, if we call ourselves that. I think this is the term to be somewhat related to the lack of the honest use of research in education, until recently. On a vast scale, we have no use of research; we pick up the journals of education and they tell these cute little stories of my dear little third grade and how they did this. It would be my feeling that it is terribly important to what seems to me almost the central job to society, that is, education, to achieve not only the standing but the virtue which would come as a result of research.

Semantic Difficulties

Soc. Sc.: Perhaps the emphasis yesterday, the whole day actually, on freedom and an avoidance of what I saw as a clear commitment to a certain kind of clear intervention on the part of some person in education. I have the impression that this was viewed in conflict with freedom of choice.

Soc. Sc.: I was very discouraged at the session last night to tell you the truth.

Soc. Sc.: What discouraged me was I thought I detected several frames of reference. We use the same words but we're not talking about the same things.

Gouns. Ed.: I'd like to say that what I've gotten out of the discussions frankly was a greater understanding of my own position on these various issues, a clearer understanding certainly of yours, Dave, particularly since at a number of points we've had differences of view. I guess conferences aren't intended to achieve unanimity or even agreement. I think if they can achieve some degree of understanding of each other's positions including our own, this is something of value.

Excerpts from the Group Discussions of the
Counselor Educators

Wednesday morning, January 9

Can the Social Scientists help Counselor Educators?

Counselor Educator: I think I came here more optimistic than I should realistically have been, hoping these social scientists would provide answers, when I know from all the experiences I've had, you can't get them that easily any more than we can answer the questions of the counselees.

Couns. Ed.: One of the most significant problems facing us today is this definition of our role in functioning in a school. Some of us seem to be saying that we operate here; we'd better thrash this out and reach agreement, then ask the behavioral scientists: "How do we train people? What content do we devise in order to perform that role?" Others are saying we don't seem to have much luck in reaching agreement on this; we need a man from Mars or a behavioral scientist to come in and take a more objective look at what we should be doing in the schools. Probably, however, we couldn't agree to let him take such a look.

Couns. Ed.: One of the issues that concerns me is whether or not in upgrading research in guidance and research in its role of training guidance counselors, our most desirable approach, as a profession, is to go to our colleagues in the social sciences and ask them to work with us, or is our best approach to develop within our own profession a research tradition which may be still in a relatively early stage of development. My research partner here and I get along together beautifully; I don't doubt that we could do a great deal of research together. But his training and mine are almost exactly the same. Many of the behavioral scientists here have almost exactly the same background that we have. Should we be building, within the profession, a complex technical research methodology which most of us may not be able to handle right now but which can develop over a period of years, rather than rely on other professions. I take as a model for this perhaps the most rapidly growing branch of physics, nuclear physics and rocket physics. People working in these areas face this problem with the classical physicist. In applying basic research to nuclear development and to rocket developments, they selected the important problems, acquired necessary technical knowledge -- and had more, incidentally, than the classical physicist -- then built up a background of research which emerged largely out of the applied field. I talked with the Dean of Harvard Engineering; most of their research is developing now not from the classical physicist but from the engineer.

I think we need to find people within our own speciality to do our own research. We need to get concepts, attitudes, forward thinking, with respect to developments within the behavioral sciences and begin to get some basic frame of reference for counselor education. What we've been guilty of in the last quarter of a century in this country is taking a little snatch here and there with never any integration.

How can Social Scientists help Counselor Educators?

Couns. Ed.: It seems to me this morning that, while we like the behavioral scientist and dearly love being with 'em at Arden House, we don't need 'em; we don't

think we need 'em. We've been just talkin' like counselor educators at a meeting. I would like to get to the topic and make at least one expression for Esther's sake. I'd like to let her know that I've got an insight from Solon Kimball and I'm going to translate it into action. The idea is that before I leave I want to get him to tell me how to make interested members of participant observers so that they can go out into the small schools and work one day a week and really study the dynamics of the school and the community.

Couns. Ed.: I wonder if we've been asking the right kinds of questions of these people. Probably our greatest need is for a consistent theoretical undergirding which is peculiar to our field. Instead of asking the kinds of questions that we've been asking, that is, "What kinds of research have you done? How might we copy your patterns?", maybe the question we should have asked is, "What steps did you go through to formulate the theoretical undergirding that would be characteristic of your particular speciality?"

Couns. Ed.: What I would like to see these behavioral scientists do is to expose themselves, their concepts, attitudes, and their feelings and then I would take out of it what I wanted.

Couns. Ed.: I'm not too sure that we need to start from scratch, nor are we completely devoid of any underpinnings at all that determine courses of action for our research and teaching methods. Certainly we can and do draw heavily upon well-recognized concepts and theories in the field of personality and within the areas of learning as related to counseling, and related to measurement. I don't feel like starting out and finding a fresh new theory.

Couns. Ed.: We have a very strong base in psychology in most of our schools. We need to extend our base in most other areas. We try to get some of these other things in but we haven't been able to formalize them as well. We need time to formalize our integration of not only anthropology and sociology, but also economics and political science.

Couns. Ed.: What we've done is look at psychology and say measurement has meaning for us, to our program. I don't think we said to psychology "What have you got that we can use," because they didn't know what we needed to have and I don't think we can say this to an anthropologist or sociologist either... His only reasonable answer is, "Well, what do you want to do?"

Couns. Ed.: My point is that this is the wrong question. I want them to expose themselves to me and I'll take from them what I want. I don't want to tell them a little bit about guidance and counseling and the chaotic state it's in right now. I want to associate with an anthropologist so much in so many ways that I can see what he's got and then I can ask him for it.

Couns. Ed.: I agree with you, but I feel there's something important that came out of our discussions. Their inquiry as to who we were helped me to see that the counselor's role is one of planned intervention in the lives, growth and development of children.

Couns. Ed.: I'm not sure I like the word intervention. This planned intervention on the part of the counselor in the local school must also involve planned intervention in the processes of the institution within which this is happening. I think one of the significant things coming out of our discussion was a clinical psychologist and a historian both saying, "I don't see how guidance functions effectively in a school without involvement in institutional process."

Couns. Ed.: The complaint that was verbalized most frequently was the problem of being held accountable without the benefit of any authority.

Couns. Ed. Tiedeman said the question is: What is the counselor responsible for and what is he not responsible for? Tiedeman is pleading that there is a certain aspect of the educational enterprise, for which I as a counselor, ought to be accountable; that is the personal integration of the individual.

Couns. Ed.: If we really believe that counseling is worthwhile because it helps kids understand themselves better, it seems to me that as a profession we ought to try to understand ourselves and our profession better. One of the things these scholars could do for us would be to use us as objects. A sociologist would be fascinated with our profession, the fact that it's changing, the fact that we're kind of a schizophrenic group. I would think that they would like to study how a kid becomes a counselor, how he identifies himself with the profession. And our professional group, I think, would make a very fascinating subject. They've studied medical students, prostitutes, let them study counselor educators. I think we'd be in much better shape if we could look at ourselves.

Couns. Ed.: We've got a little bit of an inferiority complex; we see ourselves as spreading all over the map but as I look at these other fields, they are spread just as badly. The cleavages are just as great.

Couns. Ed.: I didn't mean to suggest we were a horrible example; I did mean to suggest that if we really believe that self-knowledge helped, then knowledge about our organization, our processes ought to be helpful. We get to the point that we're so bound up with defending our prejudice our power, our control over whatever this role is, that we can't even talk to each other any more.

Couns. Ed.: What I hope to do this afternoon with Larry is to try to map out a couple of things we do when we get back home. I don't know whether we'll actually get any research proposal together in the time allowed.

Couns. Ed.: I think it's kind of ridiculous for me to travel 1000 miles to talk to a guy whose office is next door.

Couns. Ed.: It reminds me of the story of the Italian woman who entices a man in for dinner and then locks him in a room with her daughter for four days and afterwards insists they get married; I may or may not be interested in doing research with my research partner but I don't want to feel obligated to do research with him -- rather I'd like to continue to explore and use the other sciences, particularly the non-psychology sciences. There is much that we can learn from the physical sciences. Why don't we say to them, "Come on over here and see what I'm doing and you tell me what you can do to help me."

Couns. Ed.: I suggest that you won't get many people coming over to your office on the other side unless you pay them and put them on your faculty, pay them to do research, as happens in medicine, for example. People who do the medical research are the ones who are paid and on the staff of the medical hospital, not the ones who are over in the biology department.

Couns. Ed.: Is it fairly common to have a full-time sociologist on the guidance institute staff; is this done? We've done it three years now; I don't know how common it is.

Couns. Ed.: No, it isn't common. It is common to have someone some of the time.

Couns. Ed.: Well, maybe this is a way to titillate the interests of the sociologist at the same time making sure that you and your students learn something about his field.

Couns. Ed.: So that when we go back, one of the outcomes of this might be more communication, more involvement, more interaction with people from anthropology, sociology, political science, and the like in our institute, both through our people taking formal courses within those departments as well as them participating perhaps in ours.

Couns. Ed.: See if I can carry this one step further in the direction you are leading us. Would you want to use these other disciplines? Most of us have used particularly psychology. Now look at these others, what would you like to see in our counselor training programs, particularly on the doctoral level? -- sociology, economics, anthropology, political science, philosophy, history, and then I'm sure somebody mentioned the other day, biology. We haven't dealt with this yet, and, I'd say, some of the other physical sciences are also important from the point of view of methodology; at the least, I'd say these seven. Why don't you get someone from each one of these fields -- seven -- and each offer a one-year course? You see what I'm saying, we've got to find some way to realistically bring the contributions of these other behavioral sciences, including psychology, to our programs. Find some structure for it. One of the possibilities is to bring people onto our staff from these other disciplines. It is probably unrealistic to say we'll get all these kinds of people. Another one is to bring in courses; have our students take courses in these areas. I'm sure we all have had the experience of taking these courses and finding them incredibly inappropriate and also finding that our students have to compete with students on a higher level in their own field. A third way, which we have tried in a very small way on our campus, is to develop special seminars.

Couns. Ed.: We've had a two-day program on the non-psychological behavioral sciences twice; this isn't enough. Perhaps one approach would be a year-long seminar which brought in different members of these disciplines. I know from past experience with similar sorts of things this also has a great danger of weakening and watering down the content.

The Selection of Students for Counselor Education

Couns. Ed.: It seems to me that what we are implicitly admitting here is that the kind of preparation that the potential counselor brings to our programs is inadequate, but we'll live with it. We're ignoring the fact that what we really need are the educated students. The vehicle for producing these is already established -- it's called a liberal arts college. We keep running away from this problem all the time. But everytime I raise a question as to whether or not we really pick potentially the best people for counselors when we pick teachers, I'm considered disloyal; my colleagues in the profession run out and gather faggots, somebody pounds a post in the ground and they get the chains ready.

Couns. Ed.: Some -- not all, but some -- of the least liberally educated people are those who get a degree in liberal arts and sciences. I'm not spoiling your basic point of view but I think we must not simplify this in terms of labels of kinds of preparation by college and degrees.

Couns. Ed.: For over 20 years we've had what we call pre-professional education for guidance counselors; its main purpose is to try to help these youngsters to

plan an undergraduate program that makes more sense.

Couns. Ed.: I'm just getting these kids for the first time, they're beginning to come in as freshmen saying "I think I want to become a counselor." I begin to suspect we are moving toward some sort of professional image that people recognize. They come in to me and I can't really tailor a program that makes me at all happy, because first they have to become teachers; this limits what they can do as an undergraduate.

Couns. Ed.: I'm satisfied that we have hit one of the important solutions and that is the undergraduate pre-professional preparation. I'm also satisfied that this is a significant step forward. I think that there is another direction which I want to throw out which may be more controversial. We might think about developing frankly specialized, one-sided counselors amongst our trainees. One university specializing, for example, in developing anthropologically-oriented counselors, another in politically-oriented counselors, -- or the other possibility of building individual programs within our programs, orienting one student's program heavily and frankly toward anthropology, for instance, and making him a unique specialist in this particular area -- anthropology and guidance. I'm not too concerned that every person who goes into guidance should have all these same exact courses.

Couns. Ed.: Master's level, you mean?

Couns. Ed.: I'm talking of the doctoral level.

Couns. Ed.: I don't believe these people are going to function as counselors with elementary and secondary schools... We might be concerned in this way for the preparation of counselor educators, or research personnel but I don't think you're going to get a Ph.D. person operating as an elementary school counselor.

Couns. Ed.: I'm all for getting counselors from other areas; I'm all for building in quality in the undergraduate education -- this is a good area too; but we could take these people at the master's level, as our programs are now, and instead of giving them a little psychology, a little sociology, a little anthropology, we need to do two things, I think. One thing is that we need to identify a foundation content for counselor education. This might be 3-6 semester hours from the behavioral sciences. I think we have a responsibility to do this. We've got a lot of technique-oriented people now, they know how to do things but they don't know why they're doing it.

I think we should build a solid content area of basic frame of reference. Beyond that, instead of sending students all over the campus, we could let the student who's interested in anthropology to take additional work in anthropology; and so on. If we do this, beginning at the master's level we would end up in a decade, with two-year and three-year graduate level people who are pretty sophisticated as school counselors and as research people.

Couns. Ed.: I don't think we're going to get counselors of quality if we're going to patch them up. It is too late after they are in graduate school. What we need is the continuity of foundation in some of these fields that starts much earlier.

Couns. Ed.: It's pretty hard to be selective in a one-year program; you either knock them out before they enter on an MMPI or some stupid thing or possibly, although hardly ever, you flunk them out during the program. You only get a year to work at them. If we start looking at them the way we do a teacher, we could

take a longer look and we could have much more of a capacity for screening out people who really either aren't bright enough or not psychologically fitted to the position.

The Role and Function of the Guidance Counselor

Couns. Ed.: Even though we perhaps have differences to the objectives of guidance we do have a vast degree of agreement. But the objectives that we hold for ourselves are impossible to accomplish except by working in a close inter-relationship with various other groups in the school setting, thus achieving change not only within our own profession but within education in general. I see a contribution from the behavioral sciences indicating to us the new kinds of information that would indicate not only possible changes within our profession but also the great potentiality for change within education in general.

Couns. Ed.: Unless some modifications of the environment occur, what the counselor hopes to achieve is impossible of achievement, even if he is given a ratio of 20 students to one counselor.

Couns. Ed.: Are you saying that you think maybe we have confined our counselor training too narrowly in the room where two people meet together?

Couns. Ed.: I would still feel -- maybe I'm getting old fashioned -- that working with individuals is a basic function of guidance. Granted that the individual will have to live in his total environment, and will have to live in a vastly changing world, still this begins with the individual. I have to raise the question: To what extent can the counselor, in terms of his total function become in a way a manipulator of his environment? Traditionally the counselor or the therapist is a guy who doesn't get involved in political hassles, who doesn't march with peace banners, even though maybe this is the way he feels, because doesn't this tend to render him less effective in his basic task with the individual?

Couns. Ed.: I get the feeling that we are panic stricken because we've been blocked in counseling, and that now we are running another way.

Couns. Ed.: Could I point this up by a specific question? The school counselor, in the schools in which he works, has been facing increasing pressure from the local chapter of the John Birch Society, the American D.A.R., and the American Legion. Several teachers have been accused of being Communist, there has been pressure to remove certain things from books because they are "unAmerican". Now the counselor, as an educated individual, will almost certainly feel this is dreadful. Does he get involved in this thing, and does he then render himself potentially less effective with some kids whose fathers, maybe, belong to the Birch Society? When you begin to wave a banner and identify yourself with standards, causes, and so on, you become more identified in the mind of youngsters as a particular kind of activist, rather than a counselor.

Couns. Ed.: But psychotherapists do walk with peace banners, etc. and I think they perform a great service even to their patients and clients when they respond specifically to a public issue. I think that they can show individuals that one isn't only an object, that he can have some strength and some ability to control his own destiny, that human beings can be strong. As a counselor, I can thus convey to young people that this is the way to engage in the encounters of life. This is providing a model in living terms.

Couns. Ed.: I think the counselor can be a model in terms of his behavior within the school. This is where you get into this leadership role of the counselor in terms of changes in the environment.

Couns. Ed.: I want to stand on the idea that the model we want to present is really a counselor being a man; then if you're not a man you're dishonest in coming across. If you believe something, do it honestly. This is the only thing you've got to be careful of.

The Multiple Roles of the Guidance Counselor

Esther Lloyd-Jones: It seems to me clearer as I have been here these days and as I've listened to all of you that we just had better accept that we have, and can encompass, in what is going to be our profession, multiple kinds of roles. I think I see some of us desperately afraid that if we don't stick tightly and explicitly to just one kind of role, we're lost, we'll evaporate. I'd like to take the analogy of medicine again. I think that some of us here see ourselves most convincingly in a role that in medicine would be defined as a role of psychiatrist. I, for instance, right now see a wonderful psychoanalyst helping a person adjust to accept, find meaning in, a very severe illness. The psychoanalyst trained in medicine knows all about it, but doesn't do anything at all by way of helping about the physical condition. The analyst simply talks about what this person does to grow in terms of this experience. I think some of us see this as our role. It is a wonderful role to play.

On the other hand, I think there's another role that we're called upon to play that we're not going to be able to escape playing because of the condition of education itself. In American education, we have the most fascinating diversity -- look at the high schools in New York City, the different kinds of high schools to which youngsters can go, and look at higher education -- what Hal Cowley calls the mangle-mangle or mish-mash. It's a rich panorama and young people are not going by themselves to be able to find their way... to use these educational resources effectively in terms of their abilities. Educators outside of our field -- professional educators -- can describe to me most convincingly that we are the people who are central. I think it is Conant's idea -- that we are the ones who must help this young person command for himself the particular variety of educational experience that for him promises to be most productive.

If we follow out this kind of role I think it would involve first some real changes in our curriculum of professional education. I look again at the field of medicine. This would put us in the position somewhat of the person who diagnoses and prescribes. But medical students get a full year of pharmacology. We don't do anything of this sort yet in our curricula by way of really laying out to our students this infinite variety of educational opportunity in the unique changing ways and the depth that I think I begin to see in these curricula. I think this is another role that is truly antagonistic with the first role. I don't think the diagnostician, the internist, the one who prescribes can be the psychiatrist kind of person or vice versa.

But I think I see another role, too, and I'd like to make the analogy of public health, the person who isn't himself going to practice as a private practitioner, as a psychiatrist and internist does. Those two people always think of themselves and their role; the public health person is thinking of the vast array of social forces. He looks at the antiquated defective system of pipes for bringing water into the city, for the disposing of sewage, right side by side, porous pipes that leak into each other and all of this kind of thing and

instead of sitting and trying to help the people of Brazil adjust to the fact that they have all these diseases and their children die in great quantities, etc., he gets out and gets after the pipes, but he understands it in terms of the consequences that the infections are having on persons. Nor does he just prescribe to the individual the medicine that he ought to take because he's got these diseases, although they've got to have more of those kinds of people too.

Couns. Ed.: A book called The Mirage of Health pointed out very clearly that despite all the developments in modern health and all the cures that have taken place, the efficacy of modern medicine cannot be traced to drugs or to developments in medicine as much as to the basic facts of the improvement in the standard of living. If we are dealing at the level of the analyst we certainly are getting some of the residue of the problems that have been taking place in society which can only be dealt with by an analyst. On another level we need diagnosticians to deal with and understand the problems that are arising. Perhaps it is the public health model about which The Mirage of Health is talking, saying that the physician who thinks that he really is the person who is taking care of the basic problems of health in our society is suffering from a mirage and an illusion. The dyadic counseling relationship as a basic model for what we do may be the same kind of illusion. Perhaps the public health practitioner is the only model -- or even at a deeper level, the person involved in social action, not only in school but in the community, which means that the commitment that we've been talking about is not a commitment to children or to people, but a commitment to specific kinds of change and development in the larger community because the resources of school or of the immediate community are not enough to deal with this.

Just as the water pipes can be traced to not only what takes place in the community but maybe 75 and 100 miles away, there is interdependence that we now have in our society -- something which frightens many of us because this interdependence is sometimes considered to be synonymous with fragmentation and alienation. I think alienation and fragmentation, more positively put, are complexity and interdependence. We need to find ways to cope with this beyond what we do in the consulting room -- which is a very safe escape from all this fragmentation and alienation.

Couns. Ed.: But I think the eminent burning question is how do we become masters of what we're supposed to be masters, namely communication, so that somehow we have some impact. We are supposed to know how to communicate with people; how is it that we're so ineffective in communicating with not only our colleagues in the school but the people in the environment?

Couns. Ed.: We say, "Here, let's change things," and yet our schools have a mandate from the public, "This is our heritage; let's not change."

Couns. Ed.: In this process, one thing that's happened in my teaching, to make this very concrete, is that I am much less concerned with process in interviewing and much more concerned with the kinds of social objectives for individuals that are implicit in counseling and group work with individuals.

Couns. Ed.: I don't think the problem is poor communication. I think that really we shouldn't be belaboring ourselves for things which are not our fault. If we would use the natural history method to analyse what's happening, I don't think it's the school administrator's fault. We make a grave error if we attack the administrators and if we attack parents or teachers or anybody. I think that because of the nature of social transformations that are taking place it is important

that we as a profession more than anything else get such a deep understanding of what's happening that we have better tools to deal with all of these situations as we encounter them. Sure we have to communicate about them but if there is a climate in which people are not willing to move to the next stage all the communication in the world won't do any good.

Excerpts from the Group Discussion of the
Social Scientists
Wednesday morning, January 9

Problems of Communication between Social Scientists and Counselor Educators

Social Scientist: We're supposed to indicate what social scientists can contribute to guidance education.

Soc. Sc.: Some of you may be interested to know we were characterized at a meeting a few minutes ago as concubines.

Soc. Sc.: I wish relations were that close.

Soc. Sc.: I heard some objections to that charge; I wonder if anyone has a different charge?

Soc. Sc.: My objection is based on the fact that I've been trying since the first day to get an idea of what conception of the guidance counselor we are to address ourselves to. It seems to me a great presumption for anybody to say, "Here's what you ought to do. I don't know what you're supposed to do; but here's what you should do."

Soc. Sc.: They're interested in knowing how we can help them explore what their role might be. Theirs is an emergent role.

Soc. Sc.: I don't think they are interested in our help.

Soc. Sc.: We had a lot of confusion in the last group; several versions of what the function of a counselor was. It seemed to me as we bounced around the description of what a counselor was -- that he really ought to counsel long problems that couldn't be handled by their teachers or superintendent -- other counselors got in there and tried to convert to utility men. I don't know what a counselor is yet.

Soc. Sc.: How can you find out till you find out what kind of problems schools have and divide those problems off that are not pertinent to the school system and leave the rest to the counselors. Then begin with a definition.

Soc. Sc.: I wonder if it wouldn't be helpful to indicate quite freely what we see as a problem here and how we can help. I think this is what they're looking for; that was the purpose of the non-guidance people being invited here. I think we ought to really list an inventory of what our reactions are, giving some expression to the positive qualities of what we see as potential for them as a profession, as a discipline, as well as indicating some of the raw things that we see as needing classification. Without these, they can't get very much from the behavioral sciences.

Soc. Sc.: As a counselor-educator and also as a behavioral scientist, I have some needs that I'd like to throw into the hopper here; you may ignore them or take some guidance from them. It seems to me that the basic function that underlies the many specific functions we speak of in guidance work, is that of facilitating human development. This is very general; I don't know that guidance or education has arrived at the kind of division of labor to permit us to say,

"This is specifically what guidance people do, and this is specifically what teachers do, and this is what school psychologists do." We want to know if the behavioral scientists could give us some leads for utilization of some greater understanding of the dynamic changes in our society, and for some utilization of our more advanced knowledge of the way in which human beings develop, particularly some of the new knowledge of the potential for development in human beings. It seems to me that we in the guidance field could begin to sink our teeth into it and stop operating on a belief and faith level; begin to move a little more close to some of the substantive knowledges that may be available.

Soc. Sc.: Facilitating movement or human development, strengthening ego -- all of these are true, but they're too broad. We can facilitate ego development, strengthen ego, etc., in what areas? Where are the boundaries of the counselor's function? We have pediatric psychiatrists; we have school psychologists; we have guidance people; we have school social workers; and we have teachers. All comprise the components of a total organization. Unless we're pretty clear as to what are the particular kinds of boundaries in which each of these persons works, we can't ever really have organization in the sense of relationship of parts to whole.

The Roles and Functions of the Guidance Counselor

Soc. Sc.: I have difficulty in understanding why the helping professions have flowered so as they have in our culture. How can the student learn to be free and responsible when the teacher has the personnel point of view, when the student has access to someone to help him be "adjusted" in order to be healthy, when he's told, possibly, that he isn't responsible? He must make his own decisions but is seldom permitted to do so. What is there about education, as it's developed in America, that requires so much guidance? This worries me.

Soc. Sc.: As I see it, society has individuated over the years, to use a Jungian term, to the point where these functions which were once satisfied in a family unit and later in a community unit are now being satisfied by a number of different figures in the environment and broken down within corporate structures into specific individuals now who are performing related functions that were once performed in the family structure. As I see it, the counselor is playing a particular role in this development and in a more primitive or simpler, less individuated culture this would be performed by the family.

Soc. Sc.: I'd like to be a pragmatist. This field is so close to the market place, so close to practical affairs it's going to be in constant flux for the next 20 years and I can't see that it's really worth the effort to define the various roles of school psychologist, etc., because five years from now their roles will be so different; the whole movement is so very new. And there is a second part of the story. Broad as it is, if you look at what they're doing, the larger component is helping kids with their problems related to school and home. OK?

Soc. Sc.: Ross Mooney gave a heroic picture of the kind of person who would be masterly professional in this area. In brief, it was a terribly wise and involved man who was concerned about children. Therefore, we can ask what variables, what change will produce the largest variance in the field? Obviously, selection. What this field needs most is to begin to attract the kinds of people who are autonomous, who care, who are skilled, who are open and who relate to children in the

proper way. It seems to me the most important thing that could be done is to begin to change the face, the image of this profession, so that you begin to attract to it the kind of people who can fill the large shoes that Ross Mooney painted. I agree with him, incidentally.

(from another group)

Soc. Sc.: I can toss in one specific thing from our discussion this morning. There's a pretty clear-cut contrast between one man who believes that guidance counselors should not have any authority or responsibility in the school system; be a pure counselor, because if he has any authority, then he can't counsel properly. At the same time there is the man who believes that the guidance worker should be an expert in human relations, somehow able to go through the school system and set things right. He would have some authority in the school system, end up kind of running the place, I suppose.

Soc. Sc.: This is very close to something I was saying a while ago. In the session this morning we started out by definition with somebody defining what the counselor does. First priority on this was personal conference; one-to-one conference. We went around the table and began to talk about this thing. "Function" came in, and then the idea that maybe what we are really concerned about, in terms of structure of the situation, is what I'd call a kind of milieu engineering, human relations engineering, building the climate, setting up norms, and building kinds of relationships that will produce consistently the kind of results that they think they want. In the context of the one-to-one idea, I felt urged to say that the kind of research they ought to really be concentrating on in the training process was this one-to-one interaction process. One of our people just came on to a very effective technique (what looks like a very profitable technique) doing a television video tape, two cameras, one on the counselor, one on the counselee and then have them analyze what they were doing, with other people interviewing them. If the counseling relationship is not the primary function, maybe this is not the kind of research conceptualization that is most important, but, instead, this whole human relations, contextual, social psychological, co-operative type of orientation.

Soc. Sc.: What we need is research into the possibility (I don't think it's possible) of the counselor operating almost as a runner of the school itself.

Soc. Sc.: Isn't that pretty ambitious?

Soc. Sc.: Well, God should go to school longer, if that's to be the plan.

Soc. Sc.: The image, or goal I would cherish for the guidance person is one in which he still works with the individual, or with the individual in small groups, and has to range all the way from a social philosopher, to a person with some rough and ready psychological skills. I think he ought to be able to ask individuals quite pertinent questions about what they want to make out of their lives. If he needs to, to ask "How much money do you want to make?" "What kind of society do you want to live in?" "Have you examined the issue of religion and personal life, and what does it mean to you, about this business of being just a consumer? Is your role in life to just buy an extra washing machine?"

But this won't be enough. It seems to me that the guidance counselor should work together with other school staff to plan as wide an array as possible of self-defining experiences for people, that they can fairly consciously choose to participate in and perceive process and various characteristics that might be relevant. These might be reading a few nights alone in a library, or deciding

to go to an American Friends Service Committee work camp, or almost anything. I'd like to see experiences as research assistants. The guidance counselor could help make these things available, and then build up a process, perhaps through groups, whereby the students can examine their contemporary experiences for future meaning. I'd like the counseling never to go further back than the last week at most; preferably the last twenty-four hours. What happened today, what is its significance for my future life, especially for tomorrow, then next week?

Soc. Sc.: I heard you say that one of the valuable functions for a guidance man is to become an expert at providing many self-defining experiences for people. That is a beautiful focussing definition because it fits in with the problem of within what kind of a social system this is most likely to occur, a sort of a defining that's broad enough to fit in many things, but specific enough to have definite objectives that can be evaluated and assessed. It leaves room for almost any stimulus. The behavioral scientist would certainly be able to help in evaluation and assessment. For example, if a fellow wants to become a doctor, should he, early in life, have time with sick people, as a high school or college student -- we could show how to assess what difference this makes to his attitudes and values.

Guidance in a Work-oriented Society

Soc. Sc.: I was astonished that I was able to sit through four papers and the plenary session without hearing the word "work" mentioned once. I happen to know about the desire of guidance counselors not to be considered any longer merely technical occupational specialists, confined to the deadly business of testing occupational interests and fitting people to occupations, which has been the traditional guidance technique. On the other hand, I'm three-quarters convinced that nothing will make any sense in this whole business unless we all accept the fact that we live in a work-oriented society. This is essentially an achieving society as McClelland suggests, and what guidance counselors primarily deal with are failures in the productive role, at any level -- whether in failing a course, in not being able to know what to do after finishing school, etc.

Let me make an important distinction. It seems to me the primary attention of the conference has been placed on assisting people to understand their feelings not on assisting people to know what to do, or to know what their feelings are in relationship to what they do, or will do, as adults. Certainly, although we hear many debates about the cultural values of education, about the necessity to prepare for leisure becoming a great crisis of our time, as the working day shortens, etc., nevertheless, it seems to me, that in the long run the primary function of the guidance counselor, is to somehow facilitate a productive role on the part of children who will be later adults and to ameliorate any psycho-social barriers which may exist which prevent the individual from achieving.

I'm not talking about achieving at various levels in the occupational sense. Rather, consider ourselves as professors. Isn't it obvious that we vary idiosyncratically and greatly among ourselves in the degree to which we perceive ourselves and are comfortable with the notion of ourselves as productive people. I don't mean creative people; I mean simply productive people. Do we easily meet our obligations to teach or is this a great source of anxiety? To what degree is facilitating the process of playing a productive role in society (I don't mean producing commodities, I mean simply playing a role of an independent economic unit or element with all that that implies) the central task of the guidance process?

As soon as I said this to the counselor educators I felt resistance because I seemed to be saying to them that I wanted them to be occupational analysts. I don't mean this at all. What I'm getting at is, don't social scientists have an enormous, or at least a considerable, role to play in involving themselves with that which only a few of us so far involve ourselves in, -- that is, the meaning of work to individuals, the variable connotations and denotations they place on work and themselves as workers, and the degree to which we can isolate and deal with barriers that lie in the way of being somehow a productive individual?

Soc. Sc.: It seems to me you are merely substituting one generalization for another one, because behind this work of preparing students to be productive in life is what you find that will make it unfeasible or impossible to be productive and you are right back to where you were -- personality, home or even religious problems.

Soc. Sc.: No, what I'm getting at is the issue of goals.

Soc. Sc.: You're covering it up by another name.

Soc. Sc.: Let me say it more specifically: A psychiatrist will often say (and I think this is essentially what May said last night): In an abstract sense, unrelated to any particular goal, our objective is to "develop maximum potential," or to "free the individual from limitations that he feels are anxiety inducing" or what have you. This is general; I'm saying that, on the contrary, if we are to think of the guidance person as a special kind of person, there is a specific goal towards which all these other manipulations are aimed, which is the "achiever."

Soc. Sc.: You haven't told us what you mean by "achiever." You left that as broad as anything else. Is an artist an achiever, a poet?

Soc. Sc.: Yes, yes.

Soc. Sc.: Then you're right back to where you were.

Soc. Sc.: No, there are poor artists and better artists. Artists wish to produce what from their own subjective point of view is art of value; there are values attached to the process. Can we assist individuals to be artists? Can we assist them to become people who are able to achieve what they wish to achieve in terms of values of artistic production? When I say production, I cover the waterfront. A service is production.

Soc. Sc.: What makes it difficult is that you employ the term "work." "Work" has its own meaning.

Soc. Sc.: I don't think it has.

Soc. Sc.: It sounds narrow but the way you use it you broaden it.

Soc. Sc.: I'm broadening it to include the notion of the achieving person.

Soc. Sc.: Maybe it will help to get away from abstractions here, which always seem very neat and right, and come down to some specific instances. Let's say there's a child who is very passive and has better potential than he shows in class, has a very authoritarian father and that the essential problem here is parent-child relations. Would helping this student fall within the province of

the counselor? It requires a relationship to parents and a knowledge of family dynamics.

Soc. Sc.: Only if he's not achieving.

Soc. Sc.: This then would fall you feel within the guidance function.

Soc. Sc.: This qualification troubles me. I'm not sure that guidance is only concerned with the kid who's having some difficulty achieving. We like to think that in better situations they're concerned with all of these kids, concerned about them before they present problems. It's certainly true that in a tight market we often get pre-occupied with kids who are having problems and who are not achieving.

Problems in Defining the Guidance Worker's Role and Function

Soc. Sc.: In defining the goals of the counselor in terms of "achieving," I share with Fred the concern about using a word like this and then implying something further. Why don't we start with something further and then work backwards to the specific task? Suppose we adopted a goal for counseling as "developing a person who is more effective in dealing with his environment." This is a very general sort of thing and in what areas, then, would a person be more effective in dealing with his environment? One is the area of achievement, in his world of work, in his educational sphere that is preparing him for it, and things of this kind. Another area might be the one of being a parent, a family organizer and things of this kind. Another might be in the area of community development. Then having delineated the areas in which we feel a person might be operating more effectively, in which of these areas, and through what percentage of his time or efforts will the counselor contribute to this effectiveness? Now I think that, if you work from that angle, then we are not only able to define the role of the counselor a little better, but we'll have a better idea of what he needs to do to achieve it.

Let me say a few more things. One is I think that we are attempting to define a role in terms of boundaries but as we know, even in the behavioral sciences -- we have here sociologists and people in history and philosophy -- there is a tremendous overlap of boundaries. Can we not accept these and recognize that the total job involved in counseling is in this final goal and who does what is not particularly important. Certain things a counselor can perhaps deal more effectively with than someone else. This isn't going to prevent him from considering other areas.

Soc. Sc.: There's a difference between overlapping of function in some gray ground and superimposing one area on another so that the functions are similar between members of two different disciplines.

Soc. Sc.: As I see it, what I'm referring to is overlap in function. Take for example the area of psychology -- the clinical psychologist and the counseling psychologist, are often performing the very same task for a client at any one time. However, there is an area of operation in which the counselor spends more time than the clinical psychologist. For example the clinical psychologist will find himself spending more working time with people with problems of indecision and problems of socialization or self-development, whereas the counseling psychologist will spend more of his working time working with role problems and definitions of goals and things of this type, which the clinical psychologist will be less concerned about.

Soc. Sc.: Our focus should be on the difference rather than the overlap. Wouldn't you agree with that?

Soc. Sc.: I think in talking about what the function of a counselor is we may be unintentionally trying to put these people in a slot. And say "you are performing this function and this is it." And he doesn't do this; he operates in a much larger sphere; he has to meet the problem as it's presented to him.

Soc. Sc.: I just want to ask one question; that's all. Let's take an administrative problem in the school system. How is the administrator going to engage three school social workers and three guidance people if there is no difference at all?

Soc. Sc.: I'm not saying there's no difference; I'm saying there is a difference but there will be overlap.

Soc. Sc.: Agreed. But isn't there need, in order to understand the relation of the parts here, to really focus on the difference?

Soc. Sc.: I don't think their major problem is defining what is a counselor. They want to know how to get better people in their work. For example, what selection tests should they use?

Soc. Sc.: This conversation about role that has gone on both in this group and the group before intrigues me because it carries with it, I think, an assumption that social roles can be defined in some verbal description and hence everything can be fit to them. So far as the school is concerned the activities of the group of people, known as a specialized group, does not grow out of many kinds of formal roles, and verbal statements of roles. They grow out of a series of concerns with certain concrete kinds of problems someone thinks something ought to be done about. The process of defining the role verbally is something that comes much later and I think its function is primarily a therapeutic function. People talk about what their role is and in the process they try to get some kind of feeling of security or whatever you want to call it. I frankly think that when we're working with guidance counselors and listen to them and talk back to them about what the role of a guidance counselor is, in the long run the only thing we're doing, if anything, is to help them to feel better about what they're doing because we help them to find a way to talk about what they are.

But this rationale or verbal description of what they are still will not determine what they will do. There may be and I think there is a straining for consistency where one tries to act in terms of the image he is creating for himself. But we're still going to have to come back to a set of much more brutal forces and expectations in the community at large which will, whether they like it or not, define the activities of people who are going to be led to guidance counselors.

For example, there is no question that the majority of the public doesn't want kids running around the streets in Harlem or in my neighborhood in Manhattan breaking the windows and breaking the mirrors off cars. We want them kept out of the way some way. We don't want them in the labor market yet either because we don't know what to do with them there. They create a real problem. The regular school teachers aren't going to do much about this problem and they're not going to change their instruction program to do anything about it. So you're going to have to have a lot of people around who will take this kind of kid and find out some way of keeping him out of the hair of the rest of the teachers and out of the hair of the public. You hire guidance counselors to do this.

Then there are those people who feel that there is an acute shortage of high talent. We say, "All there must be some person in the school who could see that the human resources of the children in youth are better developed for utilization." It's by this kind of concern of the public that the function of professional groups is defined. It's not by a group of social scientists sitting saying, "Now what does the guidance person do?" It's not guidance counselors being together saying, "This is the way we would like to perceive our roles," although the latter function I think is on a personal basis extremely important too.

(from another group)

Soc. Sc.: In view of what's been said, can I pose this question? Maybe guidance people need to determine what their role and responsibility is. And since we don't know, and they don't seem to know, once this is determined we can start with this as the number one question and then proceed to say, these are some of the things that they ought to be doing.

Soc. Sc.: I don't think we can justifiably go back and ask these people to define what they've had twenty-five years to do, if they come to this conference when, apparently, they have not done it.

Soc. Sc.: Perhaps we should try to answer, but say that maybe the reason we haven't been able to answer better is because we don't yet understand how they define their roles.

Soc. Sc.: I shouldn't say I don't like to make trouble, because I do. I don't agree. Personally I feel one of the big mistakes in clinical psychology was that they pretty quickly did define their roles and what it was all about, and I feel this was a tremendous mistake. Clinical psychology defined itself as essentially, facetiously, "junior psychiatrists" and kept within that role; there are people who like very much putting them there to stay; it was a big mistake. I think very often you can't define your role in a relatively new field; twenty-five years is pretty new. It's defined by the needs out in the real social world, in a context which may be changing, shifting, making different demands. I think if we ask them too strongly to do this, that, first of all, we may be asking them for something they can't do because the definition may not be unitarian; secondly, we may, by asking them to do this, help force them in a corner which may be especially harmful.

Soc. Sc.: I think we, or I, can speak with some authority about this issue of defining goals for a growing profession. I spent four years with the nursing profession whose aims and aspirations are so similar to guidance workers and whose problems are so identical it is fascinating and interesting to me. We considered what shall the nurse be -- should she be an administrator, an enema-giver, a junior grade psychotherapist? What we discovered as the optimum solution to this problem was to capitalize on the ambiguity of the nurse's role and to try to help nurses learn a few rudimentary skills, whatever some institution expects of them, and then to learn somehow, by guess and by God, to have the courage to be what I'm calling a "mensch" -- namely someone who creates his own role so that the guidance worker in situation A or the nurse in hospital A is not the same as the nurse in hospital B. When you try to adjust yourself in a pre-determined role, it doesn't fit -- it doesn't fit anybody. It may well be that a very helpful bit of information, or let's call it a strong hypothesis, from the behavioral sciences is that to have an ill-defined role is an opportunity not a problem -- an opportunity for people to create opportunities to serve other human beings

based on their own peculiar array of talent and the limitations and stresses and strains of the situation.

In addition, even though the objectives are not defined, we know that there are interpersonal aspects in the counseling process, and we know from endless proofs that if you want to achieve some human objective involving another person, to achieve it without negative side effects, then it must be done in the context of an open and transparent human dialogue eschewing manipulation, behind the scenes shifting, etc. There are two points then: One: a vague professional objective is an advantage not a handicap; and Two: interpersonal goals are best achieved in the context of dialogue.

Soc. Sc.: I'd like to ask how you spell "mensch" and why you use the word.

Soc. Sc.: It's m-e-n-s-c-h and I use it because I can't think of any other word which describes a growing person who has a good feeling toward his fellow man and who takes his responsibility seriously, doesn't allow silly things like arbitrary role definitions to stifle his imagination, strength or what have you. I just made it up yesterday -- not the word itself but assigning this meaning to it. In Yiddish it has very special meaning -- the one that I've just given. One can ask, "When are you going to become a real man, a mensch?"

Soc. Sc.: That clarifies a point for me; no matter what they're talking about; no matter where they're going, or what they'll be, certain aspects will be crucial. No matter where they're going or how, it will involve the interpersonal process, not only with the child, but with the teacher, mother and principal. There are certain aspects of the behavioral sciences which deal in some of the things going on in interpersonal activities, whether it's learning, social structure, but as I said, we can't look into the microscope here and ask what knowledge do we have, and say there are seven important variable, etc. in social learning theory, then give a lecture. But I think we can point to the areas which might be useful and suggest further exploration on their part, in their training in those areas.

What Contributions can Social Scientists make to Counselor Education?

Soc. Sc.: The purpose of this conference, whatever their desires are, is somehow to produce a situation whereby whatever knowledge and techniques and methods have been accumulated in the social sciences are somehow made available to them. This is I gather to be our mission here altogether. If that's the case, why debate the role of the counselor? I heard this morning what that role is, there may be variables but so what? What content, what methods, what knowledge, what research techniques, can assist this field to develop?

Soc. Sc.: I think that perhaps the bigger contribution from this group would be to put to the guidance counselor the question: what are you as professionals? I think a contribution from us would be to suggest that that is a first required step before we can get a successful integration of fields or contributions. Four questions to ask would be: Why is a guidance counselor needed? What is he hired to do? What limits and what freedoms are inherent in the job? What does he want to do?

Soc. Sc.: I'm still confused about the purpose and function, despite the comment that we oughtn't to confine ourselves to that. I agree that the reasons we were

brought here were to bring to the counselor-trainee program some knowledge from the behavioral sciences. I select four items that I think, from what I gather is the purpose, vague as it might seem, that may be very important. Firstly, I think the counselor-trainee program should emphasize more knowledge concerning the process of change which occurs in an individual, through the helping process. Secondly, I think a training program should help a trainee to learn more about comparative cultures in order to accept more comfortably the differences of people. And in that way I think we can help a counselee be more comfortable with his own difference. Thirdly, I think there ought to be an emphasis on looking at the potentiality of an individual and working with this potentiality and increasing it. Fourthly, I think there should be an emphasis on the difference between gaining intellectual knowledge and assimilating that kind of knowledge for use. These are the items that to me appear very strong and items which would require some contribution from the behavioral sciences.

Soc. Sc.: I suggest that implicit in the discussion there has been a concern with the significance of the counselor; he is interested in being a professional person. This has been implicit in all of the discussions. I think the end job of defining the role of the counselor and also the end job of giving him the significance he wants demands an enquiry into the points of friction among the kinds of personnel found in schools. This would help I think crystalize the guidance worker's role in dealing with these frictions. This has been to too great an extent neglected. Secondly, I would push further a suggestion that was made last hour, namely that research dealing with the perceptions of parents, students, administrators, and counselors about their role be pursued -- research dealing with the supposed discrepancies found in the various perceptions of this role. Out of this kind of inquiry there can come a crystallization of the kind of role -- a very emergent role, obviously -- that the counselor is seeking to find for himself. These suggestions I would make aside from the rather obvious suggestion that a counselor have the very broadest education in the social sciences.

J. Kagan: I think we can make three contributions. First we can help the programs in guidance develop more objective, more sensitive tests for selection of potentially productive, happy guidance people. I think there is research that can be done to help these people select the kind of people they want. As far as I'm concerned, therapy and counseling are much alike. Some people are good teachers; some are good counselors. Training helps many of them, but I think these qualities can be spied and I think we can help the guidance people in this regard.

Second, I feel that there is a lot of important theory and research which the guidance student is not getting. I think we need a much finer appreciation of the nuances of development of that first 15 or 16 years. Some of the material I presented myself but there's a lot more. I don't think there's an appreciation of all the reasons why a kid doesn't work in school, why a kid becomes a homosexual; why he becomes delinquent. I think the training is imperfect and there is a lot of sound knowledge and plausible theory which can be communicated. I don't know the best way to do this. Perhaps special books have to be written; those I've looked at on human personality development generally don't delve deep enough into the problem. If some people who are in the academic milieu would devote some time to writing these kinds of textual materials, this would be a service.

Finally, I think the role of models is extremely important. I think that the counselor people have to realize that if they want to change a child in a direction that they desire, and consider positive, they have to change the guidance trainees, because they're not ready to be the most effective catalysts for change. They have to learn how to fulfill the three conditions which make a student see someone as a model. That is, a model is seen as accepting of the "S" (student or

child), and the "S" perceives that the model commands the goals that he wants, and that the model is similar to him. Notice that this means that this particular counselor will be good for Johnnie, but no good for Jimmy. That's very important! A model for a lower class Puerto Rican potentially delinquent kid is not the model to give to the son of the NYU professor who is also having problems academically. They shouldn't have the same counselor because the goals that these kids want are different, plus the fact that the perception of similarity is very important.

Soc. Sc.: The indication I got from the guidance people here was that they all felt a need for some kind of mechanic of acquainting the principal or administrator of the school of what to expect and how to best use the counselor. This would make the counselor's work environment a good deal easier; administrators wouldn't try to make a utility man out of him. Then, there's the need to acquaint the teachers with the fact that the counselor is not a teacher substitute or a teacher assistant in any technical sense, and also to instruct her how best he can be utilized to complement her class work. The third point, I would say, is that the counselor needs to meet the entire student body long enough to effect some kind of rapprochement -- to acquaint these students with the fact that he is not just an emergency breakdown station or the place where the bad kids are sent to because they aren't making good.

Soc. Sc.: First of all the counselor needs a thorough understanding of self-development, the acquisition of models and values; he needs to understand social pressures, demands, and expectations as they are interpreted by the individual. Secondly, I feel he needs to understand, so that he can communicate his understanding, environmental opportunities for action or behavior -- the nature of work and achievement, for example, the potentialities of marriage or early teenage marriage, the potentiality for mobility within his sphere as to courses of action an individual might take not just in career development but in environmental manipulation, things of this kind. Thirdly, how can we communicate with him and assist him to acquire the kind of behavior which will promote this change in problem solving process? What are the conditions of good problem solving? -- mental health understanding of methods, understanding of information or acquisition of information about the environment, about himself, his potentialities, the acquisition of identifying figures, models, values. These are the things that are needed in the growth process.

Soc. Sc.: I have been struck by one important point, that I want to make now. It seems to me that if it is true, and I assume that it is, that counselors usually themselves have come from the fields of education or psychology, then in this conference it would have been good if a larger number of behavioral scientists from some other areas had been involved in this kind of dialogue. I get the feeling that what we may encounter here is a tremendous amount of reinforcing with reference to the existing notions of the profession from individuals who are quite related in terms of background experience and training. It would seem to me the emphasis has been tremendously placed on the importance of our being able to identify certain forces and factors that are involved with individuals that may be important in determining the individual's behavior. In order to understand, it seems to me, that behavior we must know not only what these factors are, but we can only give meaning and significance to these factors as they are viewed in a social setting.

What are these particular social forces and factors that are important in explaining and give meaning to the kinds of individual's behavior that we've been talking about, in other words it may be necessary for us to know not only something about the teenage culture in terms of its content, if we are to be concerned on the

secondary level with the development say from five to fifteen or eighteen years of age. It may be necessary for us to look at some of the developments in anthropology, for example. And when the anthropologist studies modern society I don't distinguish him from the sociologist, incidentally. We have to take into consideration that we are living in a society in a state of change. We may be wrong in our whole approach in education when we talk so much about adjustment with the assumption that we are adjusting to a relatively stable kind of societal situation. Maybe we have to think in terms of training for adjustment to conflict situations as against situations involving accommodation.

Soc. Sc.: Most of the platitudes available to me have already been thrown out on the table but I think there's one on a personal basis. Most of us are involved in basic research and I think our research stems from our personal need so we can't change it very much. We can apply it to guidance situations -- that's an obvious kind of thing, and I think it's true that we can help counselors seek us out. I am concerned that my perception of Dr. Kagen's paper or my reaction to it, which was first of all acceptance of it, and then asking him to make applications and when he did, challenge him to quit going beyond his field of knowledge. Still I think we have to do this.

Can Social Scientists help with Research in Guidance?

Soc. Sc.: I had the impression that the conference's intended purpose of developing research has rather gradually and definitely moved into the background, so that in terms of the revised agenda that was announced today, research was not included until somebody in the audience objected.

Soc. Sc.: We can't speak in terms of a meeting supposed to stimulate research. Research, as far as I know it doesn't get cranked up that way. You expose people to problems and one of them may fascinate somebody or it may not, but I don't particularly feel challenged to pick up a new research idea that was presented to me because it is my duty to get a new research idea in order to justify the \$21 a day that is being spent to bring me here.

Soc. Sc.: Well, I agree with you on this although I think there could be the identification of some researchable ideas, researchable areas or problems.

Soc. Sc.: I could suggest these a mile a minute.

Soc. Sc.: Well, I think I could suggest a few. I have injected a few in this discussion from time to time but my impression is that this is really not the salient question or salient concern.

Soc. Sc.: But suppose both of you crank out a lot of these ideas, or suppose others of us do, who's going to do the research? Obviously, it's not enough to write it down on a piece of paper so that people representing guidance and counseling take it somewhere. This is what is not clear to me. Suppose we have to talk to a partner and make up this sheet. Who's supposed to act on these? Is it that we're supposed to get interested enough to work in conjunction with our partners, to help in this research? Now this is what I suspect is the idea, and then I think the real question becomes not whether publicly we are going to talk a lot of these research hypotheses into the microphone and the sheet we have mimeographed but whether we ourselves will go back and do something about some of these things because we're interested and think it's worthwhile, or we will in turn get someone else interested or not?

Soc. Sc.: I think that perhaps my perception of what is needed here is colored by my experience on a campus which presumably is not typical. If I were to identify three or four of the best researchers in the college of education, one of them -- perhaps the top one -- would be one of our guidance people. So, with this kind of an orientation, I was expecting this conference to have more of a focus point. I now think what really is the focus point is what can this group do to help the guidance people identify their job and to relate to the science people.

Soc. Sc.: I think they're also interested in problems of training -- what sorts of information we have that might be useful and how can they or their students get it also.

Soc. Sc.: I don't think information like that is useful or can be used for a guidance practitioner. The problem is to help him grow to be a "mensch," which, for him, means among other things to be a helping person. He probably wanted to help or he wouldn't have gone into guidance, but to be an inquiring person means to have the courage, let's say, to follow up a curious hunch he has with the best ability at his disposal which in turn is a function of his background of training, and to give him the courage to write out a report of his hunch or his observations, and to take more training in research method if it's important to him. Another dimension of a "mensch," I guess, is to have the courage to talk to and bulldoze or otherwise persuade his chiefs to rearrange the milieu in which he works in order to eliminate stresses that are creating his clientele. These are some good behavioral scientist's suggestions, I think, but so far as telling a guidance worker, "Did you know males are lower disclosers than females on such and such a questionnaire in the Southeast but not in the Northeast?" -- that's a bit of information but what the hell good is it to the practitioner?

Soc. Sc.: Might be.

Soc. Sc.: Could we phrase the question in this way: If the guidance man says "One of my jobs, as I perceive it, is to be of influence in a number of ways." Now let's just stop on a matter of influence. Could he turn to a group such as this and say "Now what can you tell me about the concept of "influence" that can help me to be of influence in a group, in a group guidance sense, to be of influence with someone who is on a peer level, to be of influence with someone who is in a superior position?" Is this a way in which we might turn and say what does personality theory say, what does sociology say, what do other disciplines say which bear on an understanding of how a person himself can influence a situation? One of the feelings I have is, if Morton Deutsch were here, for example, we could turn to him and say "What can social-psychology tell us about cooperation?" which is an area he's interested in, -- how does one get this kind of cooperation, what are some of the dynamics of it, how can the counselor behave in such a way as to cause it to happen? I think maybe these are the kinds of things that I could see a group like this being held for.

Soc. Sc.: I think conceptual models really is what we can contribute. A "mensch" as I'm constructing this system, is one who has a variety of ways of conceptualizing situations which in turn permit him to behave more effectively. Let's say the conceptual model of a social system as Sol Kimball was expounding it -- the conceptual model of, let's say, the other person as a black box and how do you arrange conditions so that he becomes more transparent and so on. These are a sort of scientific fiction that we find useful in making sense out of our data and which a practitioner -- I know from personal experience -- can find useful in aiding and abetting practical endeavors. We can offer this both through personal interchange and through publication.

Soc. Sc.: "Carrying on research in the field, " I judge means the field of guidance training, though it could be interpreted otherwise.

Soc. Sc.: This is again a question that the nurses raised; we answered it in the following way: research is not the administration of the Edwards personal preference test, to psychiatric versus general floor nurses. Research is a frame of mind as well as a discipline; it starts out with a question and preliminary, crude, unreliable observations and ends up in more precise formulation of a problem and more vigorous method. You begin where you are. We urged and encouraged and rewarded the nursing faculty to look at the questions that come up. "I've noticed that that patient slept better when I gave him a backrub." So we would propose the hypothesis that backrubbing reduced the needed intake of sedatives, and they would do the best observation that they could, and write it out. The same would hold true for guidance workers. They should not follow the example set for them by psychology, educational psychology, personality psychology, rat psychology, but instead let the action science of guidance grow out of this encouraged process of asking questions of what I am doing; things that I see in process, and writing about it. The emphasis must be on writing it out, because this in turn permits someone else who has more talent, let's say, say, to do an experiment. You need hypotheses as much as you need rigorous method.

Soc. Sc.: You're saying they should do their own informal research and turn over these hypotheses to scientists for formal research.

Soc. Sc.: But you see they will pursue them with as much rigor as the three or four post graduate years have built into them. It is my observation that the guidance people whom I have known, instead of developing new methods, etc., that grow out of their own existential situation, have mimicked psychometric research. Now psychometric methodology is a powerful tool but it's elegant and you have to learn how to adapt it to the questions germane to your own area.

Can Social Scientists Contribute in any way to Counselor Education?

Soc. Sc.: In danger of being very unpopular with the group I think we'd be derelict if we didn't come back to the original questions that were sent to us prior to our coming here. There was, I judge, at least a steering committee or someone who structured these questions with something particular in mind, I didn't bring mine with me and I'm sure none of you happened to, but I borrowed a copy and I'd like to repeat them to us. What knowledge is now available from the behavioral sciences that should be applied in guidance projects -- I judge from the point of view of the social scientist? How can the various disciplines in the behavioral sciences be used in training guidance workers both for practice and for carrying on research in the field? What are some of the ideas for research that might be undertaken by the guidance educators and their research partners? -- I judge in conjunction with each other.

Whether it's \$21 a day or not is beside the point, but I can't quite feel comfortable that we have been asked to come here to answer these three questions, and if we do not answer these three questions for these people, or try to answer them, they can certainly blame us, and they can say that we have nothing to offer. Now this may be true. I believe that if we have nothing to offer them in answer to these questions, we should boldly and frankly say so. If we think we have something to offer, we should as boldly say so. If we are not sure, we might suggest that maybe we have something to offer, which I don't like.

If we are not mature enough in our own discipline to come to grips with this, having had this sufficient time in which to think about it, then we are no better than they who obviously have hashed and mishmashed and, from my point of view, quite obviously don't know where they are going -- they don't know exactly what they're after; they don't know whether they are therapists or guidance men. Some of 'em don't seem to know the difference between the two when you hear them talk. I just can't believe, Mr. Chairman, we'd be fair as a group if we do not do the best we can to answer these questions. I think when you said that social psychology has something, you're on the right track. And I think it must be pulled down with specifics and not kept up here in an atmosphere of fuzziness and uncertainty and opportunity for, well, seeing how your voice sounds, if you please, before a group. They want an answer. If we haven't got it, let's tell them so.

Soc. Sc.: I would respond to the first question that we have a tremendous amount to offer. For example: social learning theory, personality theory. It may sound up in the air when a person asks how to learn about cooperation from social psychology, but how does one respond to that question? Mostly by informing him where and in what areas we have a lot of information. I can't believe that "what knowledge is there" means that we have to write out a big course on the application of social learning theory.

Soc. Sc.: I agree with you, but they want an answer here to the question they phrased, and if we must interpret it in our way, we must say that we are doing it.

Soc. Sc.: Yes, but one difficulty in answering the question is they have to tell us where they're going.

Soc. Sc.: Part of our inability perhaps to answer properly is the fact that we have become enmeshed (at least, I have individually experienced this) in their misunderstanding about where they're going and what their purpose is.

Soc. Sc.: That doesn't bother me as much because I contend they ought to know something about social learning and personality theory, and I don't give a damn where they're going. It's not that I don't care, I do care, but no matter where they're going, this is a real problem. I think Bob there had a very good suggestion that sociology and anthropology and the history of education can be of help. People need to know social structures; I wish there were political scientists here who could help along the line of showing where the political pressure is put on them. I think there are some things, given the general nature of what they're going to have to do within certain limits, that we do have some knowledge about.

Soc. Sc.: We should make them at least aware that there is a social context within which learning occurs. Maybe they ought to look at this. Where does the counselor fit in this context of social process of learning? This I think is a rather significant difference from what has been the traditional background of learning conceptualization, focussed on the individual and individual differences.

Soc. Sc.: One thing I've picked up as equally important, for the guidance counselor trainee, is to understand the social structure and organization of the school system and the social system within which he, as the student, functions. In this interaction a vivid conceptual picture of the social structure within which he is functioning can contribute certainly to becoming a "mensch." It gives him a better map of his world.

Soc. Sc.: Social psychology and psychology constantly contribute to the training of counselors. I think they concentrated on these partly because the counselor trainers have been focussing on contributions to understanding students or clients rather than on their milieu.

Soc. Sc.: Sociologists rather than psychologists are dealing with that.

Soc. Sc.: Social class, modern marriage, society as the milieu out of which the students come; what's the system within which the guidance worker operates, as a professional member of the school community? All these are important for the counselor.

Soc. Sc.: Maybe we should look at the second question. "How can the various disciplines of the behavioral sciences be used in training guidance workers both for practice and preparing research in the field?" I think it's a double-jointed question and we've dealt with part of it, but we haven't touched on the second part of it and I believe we'd be unfair to the problem if we kept this in the broad terms disciplines. If, as you indicated, sociology could contribute something to the study of small groups, I may be in agreement with it, perhaps political science has something to contribute, but I think we ought to be specific enough to say that, as we view these disciplines in the social sciences, this area of sociology or political science or psychology or social psychology could make a contribution. I believe it would be amiss if we would allow ourselves to be as loose and general as apparently they are, because this apparently is one of their very serious problems and they've come to have a great awareness of it.

PANEL DISCUSSION

Wednesday Afternoon

January 9

THREE COUNSELOR EDUCATORS

Edmund Gordon
Robert Stripling
Herman Peters

THREE RESEARCH PARTNERS

David Tannenbaum
T. H. Kennedy
Merle Borrowman

Nicholas Hobbs presiding

The Panel members report their perceptions of what is happening at the conference and what might or should happen thereafter.

N. Hobbs: The objective for this conversation today is to see if we can pull together the many diverse trends of thought that were woven in our several meetings in the course of the day. Tie things up. I've asked six members of the conference to get us started by simply reporting on some of their dominant impressions -- this by way of invitation to you to do the same. This gives us a systematic way to begin, to get some synthesis in our thinking. I'll just switch back and forth between counselor trainers and the research partners.

Edmund Gordon: It seems to me that we have probably today come closer to summing up our need for knowledge than to defining the need in the two groups in which I participated this morning. It seemed that some of us who are more identified with counselor training were asking for kind of specific information from behavioral scientists with respect to an understanding of the dynamics of social and behavioral change and understanding of the mechanics of human development as they may be related to our work. However, what struck me most about today, and I'm not sure that I can separate it completely from the entire conference, is the existence of possibly four areas of conflict, four dichotomies, four areas of contradiction. Since I have only three or four minutes, I'll try to identify them.

As I walked through the snow this afternoon I thought if I had a half hour to develop them I might really make a contribution, but I don't have that, so I'll simply identify these four areas of conflict. One -- this one is operational -- seems to be a conflict in communication between guidance people and behavioral scientists. It seems that those of us from guidance are saying to the behavioral scientist, "Tell us what we should know about your field that will enable us to improve our field." Those of us who are principally identified with the behavioral sciences seem to say to the guidance people, "Tell us what you're trying to do or should be doing so that we can look at what we know and see if there is something we can say to you that is to the point." This Alphonse and Gaston relationship, when we go back home, won't be very productive. I suspect that we've got to really jump in and start giving and taking.

Maybe one of the reasons that those of us in guidance have had some difficulty in telling you what we are or should be concerned with is reflected in the other three areas of conflict. These I'll try to identify very briefly. There seems to be a conflict with respect to the whole question of freedom and responsibility. There are those of us who seem to believe that freedom and responsibility are operative at all times and at all levels of development, and those of us who believe that freedom is the product of experience and the discharge of responsibility at particularly critical periods in the life of the growing individual.

A third area of conflict is a conflict between our concern for the advancement of the quality of human mastery or human achievement and our concern with raising the level of achievement in underdeveloped people. Parenthetically, I should say that I don't feel that these two are necessarily contradictory.

The last seems to be a conflict between those of us who are concerned with maintaining the pre-eminence of the interpersonal relationship in counseling as a major vehicle for influencing development, and those of us who are concerned

with stressing the importance of management of encounters with the environment as a principal determinant in the facilitation of development.

I suspect that if we were able in the next few years to resolve these conflicts, we might come closer to answering the questions that Esthers Lloyd-Jones and Westervelt have invited us here to solve.

N. Hobbs: That's extremely helpful, Ed. I know many of us will want to respond immediately. Shall we listen to all this first and then respond...?

David Tannenbaum: Because of the limited time let me first say this and then go on to something more positive. I think Dr. Cowley's taxons example of function and structure are equally as applicable to the study of one's own profession as they are to the study of structure. It seems to me that there is probably some confusion as to role and function and structure related to the guidance enterprise.

Having said that, I'd like to go on to something about which I think it is almost presumptuous of me to speak. Drawing from my own experience and the little experience I've had with the conference here, I would like to indicate what, as far as the content for training is concerned, seemed to come out of the groups that I attended with some considerable force. That is, that there is need for content to take into consideration the development of the client, for working with him as an individual or dealing with a parent, etc. We ought to understand, perhaps, more deeply the maturation process itself, which includes both normal development and psychopathology. Included also is the need for an integrative view of the individual as a bio-physical, social, psychological and spiritual organism. I think there was an emphasis beyond understanding something about the growth process itself, which may transcend intellectual understanding -- an indication that there is something beyond knowing about

identification or resistance, ambivalence, projection, etc. How do you deal with that "something beyond" in a constructive manner?

In relationship to that, it seems important, too, that skillful supervision in training be used to instigate a self-awareness in the guidance person so that he may be able, through his own self-awareness, to begin to understand the self of the other individual. In other words, a more organic learning is important.

There was stress on the point of view of comparative anthropology, as important for a contribution to be made and some assimilation to be obtained in relation to being able to appreciate the differences in others -- all kinds of differences. Then there was emphasis, too, on the need for content in training regarding social roles, as these are shaped by the changing contexts that are occurring today in relation to work and leisure and as these roles can be understood when we look at the community in relation to the life career of an individual. These are some of the big emphases on content and there was also an emphasis on the need for the kind of perspective which we've adopted in the conference here -- the holistic view or orientation to man, fed by the continuing relationship of the guidance personnel and guidance educators with the behavioral sciences.

Equally important in the guidance program is the emphasis on prevention. There are a number of research possibilities that were thrown out, that are equally important for guidance to keep in mind. One: the psycho-social barriers, what are they? and what can we do about dealing with them effectively?

I want to mention in closing one important area and that is the selection of persons for training. This received a lot of comment and this is where there is considerable need for research. I merely identify a number of things which from my personal point of view, as well as from some of the comments of others, have come out very, very strongly and require some research. First, a person ought to be able, who's going into the guidance training program, to have some

ability to conceptualize; he should have a real liking for people, and for helping others. There ought to be a considerable amount of self awareness in the individual, an ability and capacity to relate spontaneously to individuals, a capacity for accepting one's own weaknesses as well as strengths and being able to affirm these. Another item would be a view of the outside world as having potential -- having an optimistic view of the world outside, and having some connection with the world outside. Another aspect would be a basic trust in the potential of the individual and therefore an orientation toward helping the individual to utilize his capacities. Perhaps another item here, in terms of criteria for selection, would be to look at an individual's life experience to see whether or not that life experience manifests interdependency. I've already mentioned the importance of being able to accept the differences of others through the experience of being able to accept one's own difference. Lastly, I might mention the importance of the counselor being a non-controlling person who can allow the client to experience himself as a person, who can help him shape ego-ideals that evolve from changing identification.

N. Hobbs: This pushes you awfully fast, David and I hope all of you -- Dave and others will come back as we get to our general discussion because there are several points here that can certainly benefit from elaboration by you personally.

T.H.Kennedy: I feel like the man who is introduced into the harem with fourteen women. I know what I'm here for but I don't know where to begin. There will be just a little bit of overlap with the other two speakers. I've tried to set this into two blocks. You'll want to call the first block critical statements, or suggestions. What I have to say does not include all the social scientists that are here but at least each one is included by one block or the other.

The first point that I wish to make in the first block of comments is that

there was confusion. It did not seem clear to all social scientists why the tone of the conference was set in the framework of therapy that it was. Apparently there was not a clear conception of therapy vs. guidance. That along with the attempt to be purist and keep theory foremost and not deal with the practical work of the guidance educator seems to me somewhat unrealistic. Second was the introduction by a conference leader of the use of the word "intuition" as a means of understanding the patient or client in the relationship. This is a word that is not a good one for social scientists; they don't like it. They did not approve of this being presented with no critical comment on it. Third was the impression that some of us have that the counselors are dealing principally with deviants of a special class. Another point will go with this a little later. Fourth was the feeling of a general fear of a positivistic approach to problems. This became evident as I listened throughout the first two days of the conference. Fifth, there seems to be a fear on the part of the counselor-educators that they are not a real part of the power structure of the organization in which they work. I don't know whether you call this fear, uncertainty, anxiety, or how you express it. A corollary of this is that there is a fear, therefore, to move into research because of the displeasure that it might bring from the power structure. And further, there is some intimation that the counselor-educators should or would like to be definitely a part of the power structure and so be openly recognized. Sixth there is a lack of a positive approach to the whole process. The approach has been negative and corrective and not a positive one, at least the frame of reference that has been set for me has not been positive. Seventh: in the desire not to be classified as vocational counselors, guidance counselors have overlooked the fact that Western culture is structured on the basis of the work world. Work has a great and important place and sometimes an almost divinely-approved position in Western culture and this must be recognized as still very much a part of our values. Eighth and finally, among my critical comments: there seems to be

uncertainty on the part of educators of counselors regarding what counselors' work in the system really is and what they are really trying to do.

We were asked three questions. I hope all of you remember them; I'm not going to be nasty and read them back to you. We were brought here, invited as social scientists to contribute to you if possible -- what could we do was the way the question was asked. The social scientists I talked to believe that we can contribute. First: we can contribute to a better understanding of the social structure, of the organization of culture, as these affect both the student and the counselor function. Second: the work done by the social scientists in small group research can contribute materially to the point mentioned above. Third: you can follow in part the example of the social scientist in not being afraid to initiate research even in their own areas, even on the most elementary level. You have a question? Seek an answer. It doesn't always have to follow a model, it doesn't always have to follow a survey; there are a lot of ways of seeking. Fourth: we can help construct these models even though the reaction to the Kagan suggestion was negative, or seemed generally to be. I think there is a point that can be well taken here. Fifth: the work such as that done, for example, in political science (we don't have one here, I think) on organization, structure, pressure groups, public opinion, etc. could be utilized in making decisions about structure in research. Sixth: we should not, as social scientists, tell you, as educator counselors, what to teach in your programs or how to answer the problems of research per se. And, finally, the body of material with which you have to deal is not greatly different from areas in which we work, and you may profitably borrow, as we have borrowed, from other areas. We borrowed, I think very profitably, from physics but we didn't run to the physicist or didn't ask the physicist, "What can you give us?" We went to what they had done and we looked at it carefully. We selected some and some we junked. Some of it we messed up. But I do not feel that we should say, "This is the way you structure a project."

Merle Borrowman: I'm glad to follow Ted because he began to break your set and I want to break it even farther. You'd like to talk about how to guide people and you'd like to use the language of social-clinical psychology and I like to talk about that problem with that language because I know so little about it that I am unaware of the limits of my own biases, therefore I can speak comfortably. Also, because I don't have to do anything about it; I can speak irresponsibly.

If I'm going to speak as a historian I'm going to have to use a different language and talk about something else. I'd like you to come along with me while I talk about the tactics of how an educational function develops in American culture. I'd like to disabuse you of an assumption that a certain scripturally sanctioned historical generalization carries. You have, it seems to me, throughout the past two or three days talked as if the biblical passage "In the beginning was the Word" constitutes a primary historical generalization with respect to school functions. It doesn't. A function in a school does not develop out of some rationale of what the school ought to be doing, or what certain people in the school ought to be doing. It develops when the society clearly perceives that it is paying an expensive price for some condition that has developed out of group forces, or when it clearly perceives that by certain actions it can exploit resources.

Grossly oversimplifying what happened, let me suggest: that the movement to establish people who are labeled as guidance counselors and who have an office with the label "guidance" on the door began in the United States not with the serious thought of "What is a guidance counselor?" or, "What ought guidance to be?" It began with the lice on the heads of the kids in New York City schools, with 10,000 boys roaming the street in Boston and a series of industrialists who now needed employees who were functionally literate. These problems, the kids in Boston, the lice on the heads which kept the kids in New York from doing a decent job in any scene, the need of the employer, began to develop a class of

people who could do something about it. I'm sure you'll remember the superintendent of schools in New York who was asked, "Why in the world do you have guidance counselors?" He replied: "The children were there and so were the lice."

Out of this, after guidance people and others had thought for a while, we began to talk about educating the whole child, which is another and more dignified way of saying that the lice follow the kids to school. But it's the lice and the unemployed, unhoused, and ill-fed and unclothed kids; it's the factory owners who want somebody who's functionally able to do his job that starts this kind of educational function. The direction in which you must continue to move must be derived from these brute forces that are operating in the society. Get into a system to solve a problem more economically, then you can develop ways of including other interests and concerns that are of importance to you. But you've got to start here.

Let me talk about some of the trends which I think are going on and to which I think you should pay particular attention. The way American society is moving at the present time, the most critically felt problems, the growing problems, are the problems of the allocations of opportunities and the channeling of human resources.

A thing that the public is concerned about now is who are they going to spend money on for particular kinds of education. If I am an engineer or an admiral developing an atomic submarine, how can I get my share of the talents? These are the problems that they are going to be facing. They will put pressure on you to work with these, unless you define your function in terms of meeting, first, these conditions created by brute forces in society. You're not going to get the public to support you with public funds in the maybe, indeed, more important -- certainly to you more important -- things you would like to do.

Secondly, you have, and the public is increasingly aware of it, tremendous

waste coming out of the inability to utilize large masses of the population because we have not yet found ways to develop the talents of these people so that they can be used. These are the problem of the slum youngsters and the problem of mass unemployment among the so-far uneducated. Whether they are ineducable or not, I don't know. So far they are uneducated and there is a tremendous social price that is going to be paid for these people, unless you perceive your responsibility in finding some way to keep these people out of the hair of the rest of us.

I'd like to think we are concerned about this youngster down in the streets of Harlem because he is a human being, but we're not; we're talking about the feelings of the vast majority of American people when they come to paying tax money. They are concerned about this youngster because they can't get a good day's work out of him and they're concerned about him because he breaks the windows in their houses. They really are quite content as long as they don't believe that they are wasting resources. They are content for you guidance people to find a way to keep him out of their hair. You've got to start by doing this. This is what the public will pay you to do. If in the process of keeping him out of their hair, you can do something fundamentally important, or you can convince the public that there are resources here which can well afford to be utilized, then they will support you in more elaborate and, from your point of view, a more desirable kind of program. Start by keeping them out of their hair; this is what the public will pay you to do.

Don't get such high flown ideas of what you would like to be that you forget that the basis of your support is these bread-and-butter considerations. I think that there is an increasing recognition that the gap between what people are taught to expect to be possible, that which they expect they can achieve, and that which they actually can achieve is beginning to be recognized as the fundamental social problem.

When I define the crisis of our time, I don't define it in terms of the fear of death, because I remember going into the graveyard of my grandmother's family and finding eight of her family had been buried in a two-year period. I don't think the threat of the atom bomb is a major crisis in our society at all, at least it is not so perceived by most of the people. The big crisis in our society is increasingly we're telling people, look at all the great things you can have; look at all the opportunities that are available to you. We're dangling all sorts of goodies in front of the children; they keep reaching for them and when they almost reach them they are pulled up out of their reach. The fundamental crisis of our society, it seems to me, is developing and is quite new and is illustrated clearly with respect to our minority groups, particularly with our Negro minority both in the South and in the cities. While we're constantly telling these people, "Come on, try hard, try hard," we hold the plum just close enough to them that some of them try for it and some of them get it. Most of them after a while realize when they get almost there that the thing is going to be pulled away. This conflict between aspiration and actualization -- again very mundane things.

Yet this sort of thing is so acute that we might be able to persuade the public that the school can do something with these people -- let them reach high enough to get the plum even if you are pulling it out of their reach. I don't know if this can be done. If there is a concern with this kind of problem that you must use it, it seems to be as a basis for defining what the function of a guidance counselor is; it is in terms of this kind of problem, not in terms of what the group of us think, that this function is defined. Honestly now, if we could agree on a formulation of what guidance is or what guidance could be it wouldn't make one iota of difference, so far as the kind of support the public will give us.

If you want to make the guidance function better, more desirable, from your point of view, then you've got to start with what the people are concerned about

and with the particular ways of action that they're willing to support. Let them hire you for vocational placement, if that's what they hire you for, and then if you can expand and say, "Won't you give me a little time for this, and this, and this," and convince them that the added time is well spent, a good investment, you're on your way. That's the only way, it seems to me that you'll make the political progress that you need to. I feel strongly about this; I think that this is a cold sober reading of American educational history; the public supports a function in the school only when it clearly perceives that we're paying a terrible cost someplace or when it can see that when we do a certain thing in the school we make a profit out of it -- the profit and loss calculation. This is the way most of the changes have occurred in American education. I think they will continue to work this way.

Robert Stripling: Many of us in counselor education looked forward to this meeting; many of us thought that, particularly through Dr. Lloyd-Jones's leadership, such a meeting would, could be productive. I think that these feelings on our part are being reinforced very strongly by the exchange we've had in the last few days and by each statement. I think it has been very provocative and Dr. Lloyd-Jones, I haven't heard anything yet that I'd like to have on the tape any more quickly than I would these statements that have been made. I'd like to have this tape, if you make it available.

Many things have been running through my mind the last few days. The opinions that I'm expressing come probably from a unit of one, I don't know; I think this is our mission; it is reflected to some extent in some of the things we've heard in our group. I thought that if I could have chosen when I lived of any time in American higher education, I don't know of any period that I would have chosen over this particular one because I think we are having so many exciting things happening; this is just another evidence of it. We began to exchange ideas

about many of our problems from different perspectives. We look upon this, of course, as a five-year project that will give us an opportunity to exchange ideas. Keep that in mind.

One of the things that we have talked a lot about is how can we best utilize the knowledge, concepts, theories, talents of those in the social sciences. One opinion expressed and one that created a lot of anxiety during this conference was we should get the social scientists here and tell them about us and let them tell us how they could help us. In my opinion this is completely wrong. We are stuck with our own responsibility. If we're going to utilize the respective social sciences, we must become familiar with their theories, concepts, attitudes - not become experts or authorities, but we must get familiar. Then we must assume the responsibility for choosing ways in which we think they can help us, and go to them and ask for that help. I think that this is a very important orientation for us. I believe I would scuttle this notion that we should tell them about us and let them tell us how they can help us. I don't think it's their responsibility to listen to us. I think if we want their help we have the responsibility of listening to them, of getting familiar with their fields, etc.

Another question that came up in our counselor-educator group I thought a good bit about. In the nature of the content of our curriculum and experiences with content, how can we best utilize theories, concepts, ideas that are emerging in the social sciences and have emerged? Someone pointed out this morning that there are probably seven distinct theories. We've got a number of choices. One choice would be to let our graduate students take a year exploring those areas. Another choice would be to try to assimilate in some way some of the more important theories, concepts, attitudes, learnings from these broad areas into some theoretical frame of reference that might undergird counselor education. To me this has great possibilities and great dangers. The danger is that it might be very superficial. But it still has great possibilities. Another way that we

had thought about was that of earlier selection of students who would go into counselor education, and then helping at the pre-baccalaureate level to plan their program. One of my colleagues, George Hill, has had considerable experience in working along this line. The people in the social sciences here will be interested in an experience we shared together this morning. Within the last three or four years, there has been a marked increase in the number of undergraduate students who have come to us and who have said, "I'm thinking about being a school counselor. What would you suggest that I take at the undergraduate level?" This indicates that the image of the school counselor is becoming widespread. Undergraduate students see in this a challenging type of life's work and one that is getting some recognition in society. Another way, we thought about, too, would be that of adding to our status in an intelligent way. One example of this is what has been done in agriculture; another is medicine. They brought experimenters into their own programs, and have utilized their talents. We've done this with experimental psychology in many of our programs. We have brought into counselor education experimental psychologists who can help us with experimental design, and have helped us with research. Why shouldn't we also add to our staffs research anthropologists -- not to teach the anthropology, this is the job of their department on the campus, but to help us design research, improve our curriculum? Why shouldn't we bring in research-oriented sociologists? This is another way, it seems to me, of utilizing to a great extent the disciplines of the social sciences as we build our program.

I think our orientation in the area of teaching has been misdirected, we might say. And I think we might work with our social science colleagues in giving more consideration to the concept of the preparation of the student as a professional person, who can be freer to analyze situations and decide how he can relate in satisfying and productive ways to the situation that he finds in the school program. This seems to be an area that we need to think a lot

about, and I believe that our friends in the social sciences can help us. I'm concerned, in other words, about the use of the school counselor or the counselor as an instrument for facilitated self-discovery on the part of those with whom we work. This is quite a different concept from the one that has been in our program. I'm going to stop here; I don't know how long I'm supposed to talk.

Herman Peters: Nick and my fellow sundry members of guidance. When asked to be on the panel, my feelings, I think, can be illustrated in a story of what happened one time to me when I asked one of my students to go to the secretary and get some envelopes and writing paper, and the student went over to the secretary and said, "Do you keep stationary?" She said, "Yes, until I get excited, then I go all to pieces."

I felt a little bit like that, and I also felt, to add a note of elegance by quoting Tennyson's Ulysses, "I am part of all I've met;" and I thought of William James and, gee, this blooming, buzzing confusion that's going on. That made me think that these discussions are like a situation in which someone was trying to build an automobile and had the wheel of a Volkswagen and the top of a Cadillac and the hood of a Chevrolet and the reins of a horse and buggy, and said, "Now go." It seems to me it's been a little bit like that. And yet I thought, that's sort of pessimistic. I didn't want to add to the pessimism of my colleagues here in the behavioral sciences who talk about hortatory oratory. My former colleague was talking the other day about a free burlesque show on the intellectual plane; Merle Borrowman talked about lice and he's telling me about pulling up plums and I thought maybe guidance had gone plum crazy, so I thought maybe it was time to give a message of hope, and I jotted down my ideas.

This conference has alerted us to the variety of materials, ideas, concepts, facts, data, methodology which can be transformed into meaningful data for the counselor in the guidance function. Now basically, to me, the guidance function

is essentially a continuing process of the individual's integrating his life experiences in terms of a consistency that is faithful to his inner being looking outward. This is in contrast to the instructional process, which is essentially a continuing process of the individual differentiating his life experiences in terms of a consistency that is faithful to his outer relationship (that is, with his teachers) looking inwardly. Now parenthetically, one might say, but what about subject matter examinations? Do they not provide integrating experiences? Yes, they do, on the teacher's terms.

To me the process of integrating the guidance function is more apt to be effectively achieved if the counselor knows the critical points or periods of development which provide points of readiness for the guidance function. As Kagan has implied, as the ego or the self or whatever you want to call it is developing, this not only inwardly via nature, but also inwardly as a reflection of the environmental radiation belt upon it. Now this radiation may be positive, negative, or neutral and varying in intensity and frequency of impact, but this radiation is inescapable in a social world and with the impact of the inward form and the outer push, the self learns to handle itself in terms of the rules of the social system in which it finds itself. As the child grows into adolescence, and during adolescence, he comes in contact with a counselor who periodically and in different ways, environmentally, in groups, and in individual conference, assists this pupil to understand his progress toward maturity in terms of the social system as well as in terms of other factors.

Now, although currently this is done mainly with adolescents, it should start in the elementary school years, because if one is to distinguish between the I and the me, and among the I, the me and the it-thou, the individual must have started to learn (notice the use of the word "learn") this when he has optimal freedom of movement. This movement seems to me the concomitant of using one's response repertoire as it is formed in critical periods which start early

in life.

The counselor will be more confident of his functioning if he has a system, not necessarily fixed for all time, but a system for looking at the individual developing with freedom in a social world. This necessitates some kind of categorization, classification, or taxonomy. You can see in the summary of these key ideas that I am indebted to our distinguished scholars, Professors Kagan, Kimball, May, and Cowley for their generation of the ideas given above and, I would like to add at this time, to Esther Lloyd-Jones for her imaginative and future-oriented thinking, to Nick Hobbs for so ably coordinating diversity, and to all who so ably assisted, and especially to each participant observer who in his sharing in this conference really demonstrated the ethics of guidance. To close with one more of the quotations from Tennyson, as we go home, "How foolish to rust unfurnished, not to shine in use".

Group Discussion Following Panel Discussion

J. Krumboltz: There is one point I would like to have expanded and that is the point Mr. Kennedy made, I think it was point number 4. What did you mean by your thought that many of us had a fear of a positivistic approach to our problems?

T.H. Kennedy: Possibly I might have reworded that to have said I thought I detected some reluctance on the part of the counselor educator to approach his problems from a quantitative point of view or an empirical, positivistic point of view, as we sometimes refer to it in the social sciences - a feeling that the only way that he could approach it was in a subjective manner, because of the nature of their content, but I think you should not eliminate, or cast aside, all the notion of the value that might be received from a more empirical or positivistic approach.

M. Schwebel: I'd like to comment particularly on some of the things that Merle has spoken about. I think that the explanation of the historical forces involved in the development of guidance certainly helped clarify a good deal what

directions a professional takes: I'd like to add a couple of points. Some of the earliest formal activities in guidance occurred in the Boys' High School in Brooklyn. A fellow by the name of Weaver engaged in it. I'm sure that lice were involved.

While I certainly agree that a profession can get under way or change direction only as it responds to public and social need, I don't think that public and social need appears in blazing headlines. You know, Weaver didn't see a headline saying that the boys in New York City are not remaining in school because they're broke; he started to collect funds to enable them to stay in school because he recognized the need - because he recognized the need and Frank Parsons recognized the need. These people, who represented the forerunners of the field, were responding to a need that existed, but not in the headlines. I think that any profession that gets under way and becomes self-conscious, has the instrumentality for being more sensitive. It's very often more sensitive to needs that grow and exist, and hopefully can respond to them before they appear in the headlines.

Now assuming that brute force is at work, perhaps the profession has to be sensitive to new brute forces emerging and has to decide for itself on which side it will exert its pressure. If the public were really reacting to these issues in a rational way, perhaps it would conclude that it would be economical and profitable for this purpose to expand and divide the services for some of us here that have been speaking for it. Surely, and perhaps this is superficial even to mention, but surely the behavior disorders, the mental hospital cases, the divorces and juvenile delinquency are not things which we in counseling tend to be capable of curing entirely, but through these variety of services we hope to minimize them. Surely these things are far more costly than the costs of the kinds of services that we speak of here as a massive educational intervention. So what's emerging now is that which tells us now something not only about deprived kids, but about the responsible capacities for learning of many other kids. There is a hope that we can move to new roads and new directions and I certainly won't wait until those blazing headlines appear.

M. Borrowman: You want me to respond to that. I agree wholeheartedly but I would like to add one thing that I said to some of you before. If you take the case of Weaver, he saw more quickly than others that the brute forces had operated in such a manner that there was an economic malfunctioning, if I can use economy to refer more to human resources than to material resources, and he went to the public and said, I can do these things. I was impressed with our conversation this morning in the group that I was in because there were a number of these social scientists or behavioral scientists, whatever you choose to call them, who said, "Well, we haven't yet been able to find out what it is the guidance educators really want to do." And it struck me that there's a fascinating shift in the use of words. Because when we or the public ask you what it is that you want to do, you tend to end up by saying, "This is what we want to be." Now this shift of the verb from an action verb, "to do" is bad salesmanship. The secret of Weaver's success, in my judgment, is that he said to the public, "I can save you this."

D. Tiedeman: I get your idea and commend your attention in this problem because it seems to me that you also know that we consider ourselves to be professionals. But when you try to justify us in terms of the acts and the "do" (which I will grant you seem to have to do in our society in order to get the economic advantage, because our society tends to trust the acts more than the man) what you do is deliberately make technology and rid us of the professional problem. What this approach doesn't do is to create in the professional the dialectic of moving

around in the problem in order to put this resource to the service of the more general kind of goal rather than a specific goal. It rids the professional of the goal-selecting problem and this bothers me.

M. Borrowman: Let me respond a little to that in terms of three levels, or rather, three dimensions of conversation. I don't want to use the "level" basis because that'll get me in trouble. Now this should be pointed out; I'd love to talk to you about what it means to "do" guidance and I think it's important to talk about this, but as a professional group you really have developed three languages in a sense.

The first five years after I got my doctoral degree I spent writing papers and talking to people about what is history really. This had very little effect on the kind of historical research I was doing, but it was important to me as part of finding what I am, to talk about "what is an historian really." Now much of our conversation has been directed to that and I think in terms of your own needs as members of the profession it's quite worthwhile to talk about "what is guidance really." This is important and I make that explicit. Nothing I've said denies the importance.

Then there is the second dimension and I think this can be described in behavioral terms. This is doing what Weaver did in saying, "Where are the problems in the society, even though the society does not recognize them? Something ought to be done; there is something that we can do." You need to develop this in terms of a language that's appropriate to your professional group, and I'm not saying that you shouldn't be years ahead of the public here.

You then need a third dimension of discourse. You need to develop the habit and the capacity of going to people of the community and saying, "You're all concerned about this or that, you've got a number of cases of people who haven't been doing this or that, (although I don't know whether the guidance people have been doing this); you've got a shortage of so many people of such-and-such a level, and we've got in this community 500 kids who so far as we can tell, in terms of their genetic stock, are able to perform in this kind of function but we're losing them. We have a way that we can retrieve those particular human resources. Give us the money to do it." When you talk to the community especially, you must, I think, talk in very cold, hard, economic terms of profit and loss. You've got to say, "This we can give you." And on this level the talk that you carry on here about what I am as a historian or what I am as a guidance person is completely futile. It won't get you a cent.

H. Peters: I think, Merle, part of the difficulty is that we're not communicating to you where we see the need today that might correspond to the needs of Weaver's time, and the needs today may not be as discernible to the historian's eye unless he's familiar with our jargon today. We talk about the ego, the self and all this in developmental terms; we think we are quite specific. Jerry Kagan is pointing out the needs today, and Solon Kimball is pointing out the needs today that would correspond to the needs of Weaver's time. Now maybe the public won't understand.

M. Borrowman: I'm not sure that I don't understand what you're talking about. Let me urge you, even when you're talking to me to say, "I would like to do this for these reasons. Not, I would like to be this," even if you're talking to someone who's been as close to it as I have been. If you'll start talking in terms of the actions you would like to take, I will understand you much more easily.

W.H. Cowley: I'd like to go on with something that Merle Borrowman said about

the three levels of discourse. I think it's relevant, although a little far-fetched. Unfortunately I haven't been able, under the scheduling, to develop application of my work to this field. If I had, one of the points that I would have made is this, in relation to the three levels of discourse. We talk about "pure and applied" science, which are invidious terms in my judgment because when you talk about "pure" science you imply, subconsciously at least, that "applied" science is impure, and that it has less status and is undesirable. It also doesn't provide for the public in general a knowledge of what "pure" and "applied" science mean.

So some years ago I coined three phrases that set a triad here - a tricotomy of three levels of discourse somewhat related to yours. I call the first logo-centric -- centered on knowledge itself. The pure scientist is concerned with expanding his field and not with its application. Einstein is a case in point. The second is practi-centric -- knowledge which relates to the practice in the field -- the knowledge of the typical physician, engineer, or lawyer who is concerned with its application. The third, which is the reason for the evolution of this tricotomy, is demo-centric -- related to the people in general; this is general education. This is the great problem of American higher education, in my judgment; general education is in a sad position because it is not producing people to translate knowledge into demo-centric terms, not even for our own students, never mind for the general public. The typical guidance person is a practi-centric; they are practitioners - the people who are working. You so-called guidance educators are training practi-centric people in your field.

But there's also a need in every field for a group of logo-centric people, who are concerned with the knowledge of the field for its own sake, and who are not concerned with its application. Jerry Kagan would be a case in point. I'm a case in point; I'm not concerned with the application of my tricotomy directly. I'm concerned with filling it out, knowledge for the sake of knowledge. No field progresses in my judgment unless it has a group of effective logo-centrists for that field, and I'm asking this field, where are your logo-centrists?

Now I come back last to the demo-centrist. Who are the people who are specifically equipped to translate to the public, including the ministry, boards of education, and the public in general the significance and importance of your field? These are my two questions - Who are your logo-centrists? And who are your demo-centrists? And if you don't have enough, what are you going to do about it?

T. Landsman: I think there's another way of looking at this particular issue, Merle, and a way which has not been represented among our social scientists in these four days, and that is the particular position I think that the social scientist would take on this issue. I think the issue you have raised is truly more in the realm of political science than any other area. And I think then the question one would have to ask here, then is, "What is the place of professions in a democratic society?" Some of the political scientists with whom I've discussed this particular issue say very clearly the same thing essentially. The place of the professions is not to find out, not to do what the public asks it to do, but the place of the profession within a democracy is to tell the representatives of the public, namely its congressmen, its senators, and so on what they as professional people see is needed for the public, and let the congressmen and so on make the judgment as to whether or not they can interpret this to the people and whether or not this is good for the people.

I think, incidentally, we have a marvelous contemporary example of this, and that is the NDEA. Harold McCully perhaps can say a little more about this. In NDEA we did exactly this sort of thing. We didn't ask whether the public said,

in a sense, to us, "We need this." We went to congressmen and said, "This is what is needed to meet this situation which we see." Another situation, which I think Nick may recall, was our problems in licensing in Tennessee. The public didn't say, "We need licensing of psychologists." We said we needed it, and we said the public needed it, and the governmental representatives agreed.

I'm simply saying that I think that our responsibility is never just to listen to what the public wants to do, but for us to tell them what is needed.

M. Borrowman: Well, I'm glad you raised NDEA. As I recall the first two words of that have to do with national defense. It suggests to me that in this case it was a matter of the profession seeing that there was a public concern with defense that it was great enough that you could move in and capitalize on it and use it.

This is a good illustration of what I'm saying, that you start off with a good concern and then you translate it and use it for your purposes.

G. Farwell: This is a little bit apart from the conference maybe, but relating to what Ted and Merle are exercising here. A cousin of my wife had to see Hubert Humphrey. In talking about financial support, for example, for professional education, Humphrey made this point, and I think this will take in Merle's what-do-you-tend-to-do idea and the point that Hal Cowley is making. He felt, having been a member of Congress for many years, that the time was not yet present when there would be general support for education, because the political system of the United States just does not work this way, and that what professional education would have to be content to do would be to get its money through a number of ingenious systems where there would be a felt need.

C. Hirning: I'd like to say something about the matter of what society wants. This is a construct. Society wants all kinds of things, some of them mutually exclusive. And what the counselor can bring is maybe sometimes very illuminating; this is along the lines of what Ted has been saying - what you do as against what you are. I think Merle passed over this rather lightly because status is terribly important. When someone asks me, what can you do, well, I want to know what he means - as a physician, or as a man, or what? If it's a question of what can I do as a physician, then the fact that I am a physician makes a great deal of difference, because then my status plays an important role.

And I think this is particularly important for guidance counselors because they uniquely, out of the other pupil personnel services, come out of the field of education, and I think this is where the importance of status comes in. Who tells the guidance counselor what to do? Here is a matter of status. I work in through schools and I can see this. The principal tells the school psychologist, "You do playground duty," and she says, "Oh, no, I'm a psychologist; I'm not going to do playground duty." And she gets away with it. The principal tells the guidance counselor, "You make up schedules, or you do this, or you do that, and you be a disciplinarian," and the guidance counselor says, "Yes, sir, yes sir." He has no status to back him up in saying, "I'm a guidance counselor and you can't make me do scrub work." I've seen school psychologists, having status, able to do this, and I think that's where you pass over lightly this question of what you do against what you are.

M. Borrowman: Well, if I pass it over lightly, Clovis, it's because I was reasonably assured, on the basis of the past three days, that you and several other people would come back and emphasize it.

D. Arbuckle: Well, this is just a minor point, but regarding this NDEA (and I'm sure Merle will agree on this - it supports one of your points, Merle) I think most of us involved in it really feel that its functional title is NEA, but from a political sense the word "defense" is very important and this isn't going to bother me too much personally putting the word "defense" in as long as I can interpret it as a "national education act." I don't think I'd be telling Harold McCully any secrets to say that this is the way I interpret it.

T. Landsman: I think that what you said illustrates my point, and I wish we could battle back and forth. We structured what went into NDEA; not the congressional committees but the APGA committees made the details of actually what went into it. The congressional committees said, "We need to defend ourselves by having technical people." Another example is our interpretation of the word "able." I know what Congress meant by this, and you do too. They meant either technicians or geniuses. And there isn't a single person in this room who's involved in this who interpreted it this way - "able" has been meaning someone who's able to sit up and take nourishment.

E. Lloyd-Jones: I'd like to say a word on this just to say it, because I think what Merle has said really is very perceptive. I think I have noticed that "egocentric" is another level on which we live, as well as these three which Merle has described. I must confess that every time I hear people worrying about their status, I wonder what's the matter with them; do they feel a little insecure? They must feel a little bit weak in some way that they must so perfect their status. It shouldn't bother a big person to do all kinds of things. I think of John Dewey going around into basements, selling eggs, you know, pulling the dumbwaiter down, yelling up and down the dumbwaiter, "Do you want any eggs today?" this kind of thing.

You know, the big people I have known don't worry about status and one of the things that concerns me really very much in the guidance movement is that I think we are too concerned about this, and I think that it makes others wonder if we are little, weak people, that we have to protect ourselves so carefully and be so concerned about "Who am I?" I think we'll find ourselves in doing the things for others that need to be done, hitching them up to the great social need if we just widen out to perceive these needs - in this I think we'll find out who we are. And it has concerned me in this conference. It's just a continuation of everything that runs through the literature, that we are so concerned with our own role and not as much with what we can do as counselors for other people, what we should do - we keep asking, "Who am I? What is the guidance counselor?" rather than, "What needs to be done for kids, what do they need?"

F. Noble: It seems to me that one reason that we haven't been able to create status and standards for a place in the power structure, or sell what we have to do to the public is that we are pretty unsure what we are able to do. In fact I know many counselor educators who are pretty cynical about what counseling does accomplish. I know a lot of us are pretty cynical about what is being accomplished in the schools by guidance programs and counselor educators. And how many studies can you point to that demonstrate that it does anything at all? There is only really one man in the whole country who has ever really done any serious longitudinal study to demonstrate that counseling makes a difference, and until we can ourselves believe in what we're doing on the basis of some empirical research, I don't think we're likely to sell anything to anybody.

C. Hirning: Well, I just wanted to reflect that I haven't seen in the rank and file of the guidance counselor in the school this concern that Esther mentions

about status. The school psychologist, yes, but the counselors, no. They have rather easily taken the role that's assigned to them, and rather meekly, I should say. I don't think it's a question of a meaning; I think it's a question of what is pertinent and what is psychologically economical in terms of what the individual is trained to do, and of his competence. In this instance I cited, it was the school psychologist who said, "I won't do playground duty," but I've seen many, many guidance counselors do all kinds of odd jobs and not say a word about status. I felt for them, but they didn't say a word. I felt for them because they had to go through miles of file copy that somebody else could have done much better. I felt for them because they had to do all kinds of scheduling work that other people could have done, that clerks could have done. That's why I felt for them. I felt it was economically unsound. This is the kind of thing I was talking about.

E. Lloyd-Jones: That we're being consumed.

D. Russell: I think that this problem of status is an insidious one, not from the standpoint of selfish adulation, as much as it is in relation to the inter-relationships of the various professions and particularly in relation to the calibre of the students that are attracted to the area of counselor training. I think that all of us are aware that in the preparation of undergraduates there is a rather subtle selection system that takes place in any university on the basis of who majors in what subject. Certain subjects are chosen because of their implicit difficulty and the particular requirements of the profession.

I think, for example, of the rather unfortunate effect that I feel, let's say, a certification program in the state has upon the kind of people who enter counselor training. They are by-and-large people who have come through the definite channels of having talked to people, of having certain experiences, in the field. All right. Now we'll go back one step further. What kinds of people are choosing the field of education? We find in certain institutions I've been affiliated with that the people who are entering the field of education are choosing it for rather subversive reasons. One reason might be that they want to avoid the language requirement; another reason might be that having been inadequate in certain disciplinary subjects; they feel that they can choose with impunity a field such as elementary education, which will not demand the discipline subjects. I find it unfortunate in my teaching of Ed. Psych., for example, that a student will say, "I'm not going into secondary education; I don't feel that I have a firm enough grasp of subject matter and I don't feel I'm a good enough student." I just would like to throw up my hands because I feel that if there is any place for the strong student or the liberally educated or the very strongly disciplined subject, it is in the field of elementary education.

All right, now, here is the selection process taking place. What kind of people are being attracted to counselor education? What kind are being attracted to education as a whole? And this, I think, is a rather subtle kind of thing because this problem of status - status between subjects, status between fields - is a terribly important one as a person chooses his model and his values which will ultimately bring him to the position of a counselor.

E. Westervelt: This is in a sense a summary of the last few comments with just a little added. Yesterday Herm Peters or Ross Mooney said that you create a role by standing up and doing it. Maybe it was Merle Borrowman who said it, but in case it seems to me that this matter of status cannot be artificially created as such. You have to stand up and do. To do you have to want to do, and you have to feel some confidence in your ability to do. Now if you do want to do, you have confidence in your ability to do, then it seems to me you will have strength

to say, "I only have 16 hours of working time a day at the very outside and therefore I do not have time to do clerical work because I have to do something other than that." And this way seems to me the only way any field, any profession can ever create a status - by preparing people who can do, who want to do, and not by artificially saying, "This is the way it shall be," and then hoping to pop the right people into the spot we have created.

W. H. Cowley: Well, I want to briefly make a major distinction between the status of the individual and the status of the group. What Esther was saying was about the status of the individual. But by-and-large the field moves ahead when you've got a supporting body that can effectively support the individual and this is developing throughout all the professions. You have the medical profession, for example, that supports its own members and so on.

But how does a profession get status? The profession gets status by its performance, the performance of both the group and of the individual. To go back to my earlier question, what group organizations are doing the fundamental thinking and research that are going to make it possible for the individual to carry his work further and thus bring further status? I don't want to press my point, but one of the issues on the three points of reference that were listed for discussion was about research, so I want to know what logo-centric research you people are supporting, since you can't do this - practitioners can't do this. It must be done by people who set themselves far from the struggle and who look at it apart and then make their contributions for the record. And therefore I want to repeat, the status of the individual is supported by the status of the group, and vice versa.

F. Nobles: I'd merely like to emphasize the point. It's that status in a profession is created by doing; it is also created by not doing. That is, there are certain things that counselors are asked to do in the school that interfere with their role as counselor, not simply because it takes up the time they should be spending on a case, but because it makes it impossible for them to function as counselors. Teachers have been guilty of this for many years, and counselors, having been teachers, fall into the same trap. They perform nonprofessional functions that actually destroy their professional image in the eyes of their own clientele not merely as counselors.

W. Neff: You know, I've been sitting here peacefully this afternoon trying to figure out why I feel that this afternoon's discussion is less satisfying to me, at least now, whereas the morning discussions were highly satisfying. And it seemed to make a real difference in quality of the conference for me. The only thing that occurred to me is, in a sense, that Merle was too provocative to the educational counselors and they are reacting to Merle's remarks. I have an unpleasant sense of déjà vu.

I have sat through too many conferences of clinical psychologists debating what their role is, so that I'm thoroughly sick of the whole business. Now let me indicate what I feel should be a subject here. If the purpose of this conference is to form a bridge between the social sciences and guidance educators, then I think we're discussing the wrong thing for the last three-quarters of an hour, in the considerable sense of that term. It seems unfortunate to me that many of the provocative and possibly researchable notions which the social scientists up here seem to gather from the discussions of the last day or so have, in a sense, been lost in the shuffle or ignored because of the highly provocative and highly ego-involved notions of status and role which obviously all of us are concerned with, one way or another.

Now we can continue this and naturally have every right to continue it, but I really feel that you defeat the purpose of the conference, as at least I perceived it, if the issue is, "What is there in the social sciences other than role and status as a single element - and that also exists in the social sciences - what is there in social sciences generally which can assist the educator-counselor in training guidance people? And, if that's one aspect, then another is, "What is there in the school which is of interest to the social scientist?" because I feel that this bridge has to be two ways. My own conviction is, after listening for three days, that there ought to be no more useful arena for the conducting of social science research than the schools, and many problems have been suggested here which are a lot more interesting than what you can do in the factory or the hospital, let me say.

This is my own point of view, and I have grave intentions, at this moment at least, to try to engage my colleagues over in the School of Education in some kind of joint research project in this area. I hope I follow through with it. It does seem to me that perhaps we cannot exhaust this issue, but I think we ought to get off it, to the issues of social science which I thought was the subject of the conference.

G. Farwell: I want to talk to the point that Walter's making here. I came to the conference with some predetermined goals and I think I have had some of my goals reinforced. I'm not into this, but there are three immediate theoretical and research formulations apparent to me. First, the developing of a counseling theory in growth terms based on projected hypotheses which must be put to longitudinal tests. And by this I am referring to a theory of counseling in a developmental framework in contrast to the adaption of a theory to counseling that has grown out of dealing with adults who in many senses are sick people. Two, there must be a study of institutional structure and function leading to a redefinition of education that places responsibility on school counseling for a clearly identifiable segment of the enterprise. And three, there must be intensive study of the preparation activity of counselor education employing selection, programming, interpersonal involvement, and on-the-job assessment.

D. Tiedeman: First, there is in the discussion of status two very nice ways to turn it off. One is to say that we shouldn't be concerned about it and the other is to say we are defensive about it. I stand here because I'm unsatisfied with the idea and the fullness of the exploration of the idea, because I think in dealing with it as we do, we are troubled about the status and in reality this is where our problem doesn't lie, but it does lie in what authority we want to claim and what responsibility we're willing to accept. I am troubled to find the discussion of status turned away from those two things because I am of the opinion - and here I have to make an assertion - that the teacher has to move over in education, and if we're going to get education, rather than conditioning or some kind of fortuitous aiming of youths toward experience that we've got to have two collaborating, autonomously-operating and competing functions represented throughout education, wherever it may be.

This is the sense in which I don't want to turn off the discussion of the status problem, because it means that I'm willing to state there is a problem, I'm willing to state I'm ready to solve the problem, and I want to ask for the resources, and I want to ask for the appropriate authority. When I do, I will sometimes have to contradict the teacher, and when I do I want to be backed up. Now I may also have to contradict a number of different things in school organizations that presently exist, and when I do, I want to be backed up. I want to be backed up each time when I say, "Here, I think we need key men who are in a troika which includes the guidance function and the teaching function,

who are themselves administered by able professionals who in some cases are called principals, others superintendents, others deans, and now and again presidents."

Now the other part of the problem which got explored from this kind of exchange was that having to do with our own writing and examining procedures in order to create the ideas, open them to examination and criticism, and stick our necks out. Here I find that, (if the behavioral scientist will take this in the spirit in which it's offered) if you want to get me interested, get me interested in how you change things. That is, get me interested in people doing these things you've been studying in behavioral sciences. If you do research on that and join me in doing research on that (because that's where my own research and writing efforts are going to become focussed) then we can really turn the spotlight on the youngster taking up this problem that everybody seems to want to take away from him - namely, himself experiencing and engaging in the taking of the responsibility for choosing in life, however many resources may come his way, and whatever he may get to monopolize.

If you were to start talking about this kind of thing, start doing research about this kind of thing, I know you would get my interest. I even have a little money that I might be able to help you with, and maybe we can cook up some deals. I don't know.

Now, if we engage in this, then we've also got a few problems. You see, you behavioral scientists are afraid to face forcing people out, just as you claim we are. So you only study things as they are; you don't study them in relation to what they might be. Now if you want to do this kind of changing research, I think you have got to get the what-it-might-be into your research. If you can get the what-it-might-be into your research, then I've got some nice questions I'd like you to answer for me. Throughout the life cycle what continuity should we create, in what sequence, with what frequency, in order to get this outcome which we've been talking about here? It's simple; let's do it.

D. Arbuckle: Well, this is certainly a break from Dave's point, but this is a question I want to ask Hal Cowley, but I think his answer might be interesting to everybody, so instead of asking him privately, I'll do it now. In talking in terms of prestige, power, status and so on, I think the 1904-08 period was rather interesting in terms of medicine of the United States. And I would like your reaction, Hal, to what were the dynamics of what happened. For example, in 1904 I believe we had 148 medical schools.

H. Cowley: 188. Well, there were three sources at work. One was the public; it was very much shocked by the medical climate. The majority of the physicians in 1900 were being trained as practitioners. We didn't have a medical school worthy of the name in any of these countries until we opened the Johns Hopkins Medical School in 1893. This was one factor. Public dissatisfaction with medicine. The second factor was the medical profession's own dissatisfaction with itself. And so in 1900 the American Medical Association appointed its Council on Medical Education, which began in 1904 a list of accredited institutions. This is the second consideration, and this developed in connection with another council established by the Association of the Medical Colleges.

But the third and most important I think was the moving in to the situation of the Carnegie Foundation with its investigation by Flexner. Flexner visited 150 medical training institutions in the United States and Canada; he visited every one of them, and found out how corrupt the great majority of them were.

N. Hobbs: To relate that to our concerns here, there was the influence of knowledge in the behavioral sciences.

G. Hill: My comment is prompted by two things in particular - what Dave Russell said about one aspect of the very crucial problem of selection of people for counselor education, which I think is one of the most pressing concerns that we have in our field, and also what Walter suggested. I'd like to second his emphasis on possible research projects, because I observe the way in which people decide to become counselors and try to get into counselor education programs. One of the most determining variables or forces is in the area that David spoke of.

I would like to suggest that maybe some of us could get together on this study of the forces in the undergraduate experience of students which determine how they develop status concepts. For example, to what extent is the general attitude of academic professors, which is one of contempt for careers that are doing careers, determining? For example, David, in our institution the truth of the matter is that the general scholastic aptitude test average of elementary educational students is better than secondary education students. This is an interesting thing, and I think it reflects in part the general tendency on the part of an academic professor to say, let's say, to a boy who wants to become a major in history and become a high school history teacher, "Well, you're too bright a boy to waste your life on teaching history in high school." How these channels through which our counselor educational students come operate - I think this would be a fascinating thing to study within the institution. I picked the professorial attitude out; it's only one point, but the idea is to see whether we could determine what forces operate in our undergraduate's experiences which begin to give them a sense of what it is that it will be worthwhile for each one to devote his life to.

R. Stripling: I think that Professor Cowley's descriptions of the three kinds of people needed in the counseling field is very important. I think that we show a rather immature attitude along this line. For instance, we often develop the feeling that if a person hasn't been a school teacher first (you see this is where you start) and hasn't then been a counselor and then had counselor education - if he hasn't done those three things he can't contribute to counselor education. You see, this almost automatically cuts out the research-oriented person, the person whom we need to work in the logo-centric area - not practice, theory. I think this is a very important point for us to discern, and I think it stems from some of our prejudices, some of our rather narrow ways of looking at this whole issue of counseling and counselor education. I think we need to explore this possibility in terms of the three kinds of people that have been mentioned. I suggest this as another fruitful area of very critical research thinking - to see if we can do something about working toward a more balanced type of study in counselor education.

M. Borrowman: May I rise to a point of order? That's just an excuse to get to talk. We're moving now in the direction where we're getting a few fairly concrete suggestions. It strikes me that it would be eminently desirable if we could distill perhaps tomorrow half a dozen of these and give some priority to them. So I wonder if we might not wisely list one or two, or three or four or five, of these fairly concrete problems as they come up to consider them as kind of an agenda for the future.

H. Peters: I thought perhaps that Merle might mention one other item. I think, Merle, that in a way we do recognize that you have to do what history or primitive conditions dictate, as you indicated. I think, if we can do it cleverly through NDEA or NEA, that this is all right if it gives us latitude to do what we see ought to be done. I think one of our real problems (which perhaps many will reject as soon as I say it) is this problem of status we have been discussing,

because we don't want to do the things we know we have to do if we're going to be school counselors by present definition. This is the real problem.

G. Farwell: I want to make two points that pertain to what Walter Neff said, and to what Dave Tiedeman said, and what George Hill said. I made the proposal that there ought to be an intensive study of the preparation activities of counselor education, implying selection, programming, interpersonal involvement and on-the-job assessment. I believe that the behavioral scientists can be of assistance in taking a look at this and help to answer some of these questions.

I'd like to make one other point. I have been working for five years trying to gather data as to the contribution of teaching experience in effective counseling, and if anyone can point up to me where there is any evidence at all that the fact that a person has been a good teacher in the classroom really contributes to his being an effective counselor, I'd like to have him show me.

M. Schwebel: Since we're interested in the incorporation of research material and research methodology in our curriculum, I thought it'd be helpful for me at least to hear from Hal Cowley, either now or some other time, just how the medical profession went about determining what would be included in its curriculum and how - whether through a commission, whether through conferences, whether simply by practice or habit, through those years at the turn of the century?

H. Cowley: Through pressure groups, conferences, parties like this.

J. Krumboltz: I would like to make one statement that will be ranked as heresy, but I'm used to this. I would say that those of us in guidance have a much higher status than we deserve. I'm very sincere in this, because can you think of any other profession that can offer so little evidence of the validity of what it does as our profession offers that still receives a large amount of public support we receive? I think we are very, very lucky, perhaps, that the public doesn't know how little effect we have on students. Or maybe we're not really lucky, maybe we're unfortunate.

Now what should we do about that? I'm not averse to fooling the public, but I think there are things we can do and specifically I think there are some experimental studies that need to be done, but I do not think that they ought to be global studies on the effectiveness of guidance versus non-guidance. I don't think this kind of study is particularly helpful because the term "guidance" is too ambiguous; too many things can go on under this title. And therefore I would propose that we tomorrow at least examine some possibilities of specific narrow studies which would experiment with specific techniques to pursue rather small game and see whether or not these techniques work and use these as a paradigm for perhaps larger scale studies later. I have some specific ideas but I will delay on them.

W. Brookover: What I was going to say John said, and I'm very pleased. I happen to be affiliated with a college of education that has I think one of the top guidance training programs in the United States, and I've come into this with quite a different thesis. Our group of guidance counselor trainers have a high reputation. They have been effective along with the rest of you in getting a big chunk of NDEA money, which the sociologists have never gotten, and would be tickled to death to get a piece of. I think what John is saying is that you have status far beyond what you have been suggesting and power in the legislatures and in the Congress and with the public far beyond what the people whom you are looking at as having more status have. And you don't realize it. You're good at something. You have established a national reputation as

counselor trainers as being good at this. But if you're going to maintain your reputation as stars, as somebody who knows what they're doing, you've got to do research and demonstrate as Hal has said that you know what you're doing and that you can demonstrate that what you're doing is sound.

H. Cowley: I've got to close this by making the observation that there are two kinds of status involved here. One is the public status, which you discussed. The other is academic status, and this is the kind of status that you people are hungry for and do not have, and you're never going to get it unless you do research.



RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRAM INNOVATION

The long-range goal of the conference was research development in areas pertinent to school counseling and guidance and program innovation in counselor education designed to strengthen and broaden its theoretical foundations.

Five months is clearly too short a period in which to assess the effectiveness of the conference as a means toward this end. Many of the ideas generated and reported at the conference may never develop into research or be reflected in programs. On the other hand, the conference experience may be one of several stimuli for new developments without being recognized as such. Finally, the refinement of research hypotheses and research design takes time, as do revisions in programs of counselor education. It may be some months or years before certain ideas generated at the conference manifest themselves in research projects or program changes.

The following section reports in condensed form, 1) the ideas for research and/or program innovations developed and reported at the conference, and 2) ideas or plans reported to the staff following the conference.

POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS FOR STRENGTHENING THEORETICAL CONTENT
OF PROGRAM AND DEVELOPING RESEARCH SUGGESTED BY THE
COUNSELOR EDUCATORS AND THEIR RESEARCH PARTNERS AT THE CONFERENCE

The following suggestions were developed by the counselor educators and their research partners in a two-hour session on the third full day of the Conference. They are, therefore, only ideas for further study; they are not, and were not intended to be, the outlines of fully organized plans or proposals.

Dugald Arbuckle
Gene Phillips
Boston University

Hold an invitational conference whose theme would be "Artist-Scientist Judgments of Behavior in Contrast with the Professional School Counselor." Membership in the conference would include twelve superintendents of schools, twelve principals of elementary and secondary schools, twelve teachers of grades 1-12, and twelve counselors. There would be three panels at the conference comprised respectively of: a behavioral scientist and a counselor, a natural or physical scientist and a counselor, and an artist and a counselor. Subjects of study at the conference would be two or three youths with varying personality profiles and quite differing qualities of character. In each case a case study would be presented with the subject appearing after the reactions to the case study. Each panel will interview or relate formally to each subject, and after each such interview the panels will retire while the observer-participants themselves analyze the subjects from given points. This will be followed by a report from each panel. Other interactive plans between panels and observer-participants and subjects will be worked out.

Harold Bernard
Earl Zwetschke
Oregon State System
of Higher Education

We have been stimulated by Solon Kimball and his description of the natural history method to anticipate some research on group membership (high school sub-societies) of adolescents. We think there is a possibility that small groups, spontaneously formed by youngsters, may have considerable impact on school achievement. Certainly there are many factors in school achievement which is appropriate to one's indicated ability, but one important one might be the friendship group. Does the way in which such small groups form and the way they function provide clues which will help the school counselor provide help?

Paul I. Clifford
Tilman C. Cothran
Atlanta University

Explore the possibilities of identifying one or two areas of research which will involve the joint research competencies and interests of the guidance educator and the

research partner who have attended this Conference. This exploration may involve other people from both the counselor education faculty and the sociology and anthropology faculties. Graduate students from both areas may also be involved.

Willis Dugan
Roger Wilk
University of Minnesota

Experiences at this Conference have led us to reexamine the purposes of the guidance counselor and we find that we want to extend this redefinition into our program of counselor education. We propose to do the following:

- 1) From the definition of purpose which we have evolved we plan to examine the various behavioral sciences for their contributions to the understanding of the elements of the definition. For example, an annotated bibliography from anthropology and sociology that would contribute to an understanding of the school as a social system may be prepared.
- 2) Staff seminars may be organized to discuss these concepts, theories, constructs, et al., that bear upon the definition of purpose.
- 3) Consultants from the disciplines may be asked to join specific seminar sessions to help members of the seminar understand the concept and suggest methods of application of the concept to the defined purpose.
- 4) Take initial steps for the development of a series of broadly conceived research activities which draw upon the theories, concepts, and research outcomes of related disciplines.

Royal Embree
Frederick Ginascol
University of Texas

Royal Embree -- Specific new ideas which I wish to pursue are:

- 1) Apply some of Solon Kimball's anthropological tools to Institute enrollees in order to help them better understand the dynamics of schools and communities in their field placement experience.
- 2) Make completion of the Institute more of a rite of passage.
- 3) Work more model theory into the core curriculum of counselor education.

Frederick Ginascol -- Because the interaction of participants at this Conference seems to have resulted in a very noticeable reduction of confusion to a quite obvious crystallization into well definable areas, out of focalized problematic areas can come research which is dictated by practical exigencies.

Gail Farwell
Merle Borrowman
University of Wisconsin

Out of this Conference has come for me a clearer identification of the direction needed in developing a theory for school counseling, which must be based on growth concepts. It seems important to present an implementation that clearly identifies the unique charge and responsibility of the school counselor for school age clientele. As an educator the school counselor is committed to the educational process, but there are many facets to the educational enterprise, and the counselor should be held accountable for unique functions as well as contributing to ancillary functions having an impact on the education of youth. What is ancillary to the counselor becomes a central focus for other personas in the educational endeavor. The focus of the counselor's work is the personal integration and deeply personal meanings which the counselee attributes to learning experiences at various "critical bands or periods" (Kagan) accruing from his chronological stage and the institutional and interpersonal involvements nurturing his growth.

The counselor has the responsibility for positive intervention as youth are helped in placing themselves in the total cultural matrix. By positive intervention is meant a sincere involvement at a doing with level rather than a doing to or doing for level. Evidences derived from various sources may indicate a critical period of growth. The guidelines of this theory permit the counselor to initiate client-counselor involvement either in individual or group situations. Interpersonal relationships of substantial quality can be developed to the degree that they will be client-initiated as increased maturity is gained by the client.

There are three immediate theoretical and research formulations apparent:

- 1) The development of a counseling theory in gross terms based on projected hypotheses which must be put to a longitudinal test.
- 2) There must be a study of institutional structure and function leading to a redefinition of education that places responsibility on school counseling for a clearly identifiable segment of the enterprise.
- 3) There must be intensive study of the preparation activity of counselor education, implying selection, programming, interpersonal involvement, and on-the-job assessment.

Robert L. Gibson
Sidney Kaplan
University of Toledo

Upon return to the University we will invite representatives of the behavioral scientists' departments to meet with us and review the objective and current curriculum of counselor education program at the

University to determine how, in our situation, these areas can make the most meaningful contributions to the strengthening of our programs in counselor education. We further hope to initiate research projects, cooperatively with these departments, investigating areas and problems of mutual concern.

Martin Hamburger
Walter Scott Neff
New York University

The variables that influence the developing individual's understanding of work, love and play, as these are identified by modern social science, are an essential part of the content of guidance education.

All societies develop institutional means to train their children to play a productive role. This has become, in Western societies since the Reformation, one of the major (if not the major) functions of the educative process. My definition of the notion of "productive role" includes the following elements:

- 1) The term work includes the activity of the minister and artist, as well as of the doctor and laborer.
- 2) Each person develops a set of unique and idiosyncratically organized meanings and values with which he perceives work, love and play and their interrelationships.
- 3) We develop our idiosyncratic understandings of the meanings of work, love and play in relation to sets of social forces and social structures, which are, in our society, in process of continuing change and, often, in a framework of contradictory and conflicting goals.
- 4) As a consequence of changing and conflicted social influences, individuals incorporate the productive role more or less imperfectly and therefore the actuality arises of a special psychopathology related to the ability to work.

But children, in particular our school children, are growing up in a work oriented society, in which most of them will be called upon to play some kind of productive role. In this connection, there are certain special fields of interest to social scientists which should be made available to guidance education. These include:

- 1) The sociology of work.
- 2) Studies of the changing conceptions in the role of work in our society, both historically and contemporaneously.
- 3) Cross-cultural studies of work roles and work meaning.
- 4) Studies of the psycho-social barriers that produce various kinds of work pathology.

5) Studies (à la Kagan's) of the development of the appropriate attitudes to work, with attention focused on "critical periods" and on the negative and positive aspects of social forces and social structures.

In this connection, the social scientist can learn from the guidance counselor, since the school is one decisive arena in which the child carries out those activities which prepare him to or prevent him from learning to play a productive role. In the school situation can be carried out the more exciting and useful research on work than in the factory or mental hospital.

Social scientists who can prove particularly useful to the guidance counselor include the social anthropologist, the sociologist, and the social psychologist. These can help to balance the influence of the psychotherapist and the psychiatrist, which has already been very strong in the field.

(Note: the above proposal was prepared by Walter Scott Neff, and has been somewhat condensed here.)

George Hill
David Russell
Ohio University

Some proposed next steps are:

- 1) The development of a program of two integrated years of preparation in residence for school counselors, to enable us, despite the one-graduate-year certification patterns in Ohio, to encourage able candidates to spend two years in residence. This program would be broadened after planning as to details. A systematic effort and evaluation will be planned, to compare the two-year graduate with one-year graduates.
- 2) The development of more systematic interdepartmental discussion of possible cooperation in program planning and research development.
- 3) A study of the relation of role models to educational and vocational choice.

Lee Isaacson
Robert Bain
Purdue University

The two major sections of the Department of Sociology at Purdue University which seem to bear most directly upon the preparation of school counselors are:

- (1) marriage and family and (2) complex organizations. There presently appears to exist a greater overlap between counselor education and marriage and family living than between it and complex organizations; therefore our immediate efforts will focus upon the second.

We propose to do the following:

- 1) To initiate a series of discussions between sociologists with interests in complex organizations and members of the counselor education staff.
- 2) To seek specific research projects that will involve the above two groups.
- 3) To discuss and develop content material from sociology pertinent to the preparation of counselors.

Ted Landsman
Robert Stripling
Ben Barger
Sidney Jourard
University of
Florida

Utilize behavioral scientists in the flesh -- get active investigators on campus and off to meet with guidance people and people and speak openly about their own research, so that students can see the way in which these people address questions, grope with them, and find or improvise methods of finding answers. Such will, hopefully, diminish students' fears of research and groping in the dark on problems which fascinate them.

We recognize the importance of a set of long term researches, sponsored by faculty -- viz. definition of counselor effectiveness; effectiveness of on-the-job training, effectiveness of course work, definition of positive experience, etc. -- students can carve off a chunk for their doctorate and findings serve to redefine problems for next student.

Realize that guidance people can't be trained for every exigency. They must have confidence, boldness and guts fostered in them so that they can improvise and create their own role. We will explore ways to provide students with supervised experience that will produce, hopefully, guts, resourcefulness, etc., and compare these with students who don't get such experience.

What happens, actually, to students in supervised practice? We know what we want to happen, but what does? And does experience of being a supervisor over junior trainees help to mature senior trainees who have received faculty supervision?

Plan to bring in a research anthropologist and/or sociologist to the faculty, to help enrich the research know-how of doctoral students.

Explore ways to train students to learn to recognize needs of systems in which they work so that they can create their roles in response to such needs -- and seek to develop secure people who can tolerate an imperfectly defined job.

William McDougall
T.H. Kennedy
Washington State
University

In planning graduate level programs for counselors, continued consideration will be given to appropriate courses in sociology, anthropology, social psychology, etc. Such will be selected in line with background, professional objectives, and interests of students. Greater efforts will be made on the part of counselor educators to find out what is included and what the contribution might be in some of the courses now offered and presently being included in the graduate programs.

One research project at the present time seems to constitute a reasonable beginning:

In light of the fact that guidance and counseling in our area have achieved a prominent status in many of our schools and in light of the fact that numerous counselors operate in the setting of our schools and communities with little understanding of the place of guidance in the school and community structure, it would seem desirable to investigate using appropriate sociological and anthropological research methods to identify the place of guidance in the school and community. Such research could lead particularly to a greater understanding on the part of counselor educators of the need for inclusion of appropriate content and emphasis in counselor training programs on these factors. It could also shed some light on the pressing problems of establishing better communication among the various persons within the school and community responsible for establishing the best climate for facilitating the learning process.

Paul Munger
W.L. Cash
University of
North Dakota

We have three doctoral dissertations in progress concerned with comparing schools with well defined guidance programs to non-guidance schools. These studies are attempts to explore:

- 1) Bases in the school and community for guidance being initiated in the schools.
- 2) Effect of guidance on the perception of the environment by students.
- 3) Effect of guidance on the adjustment of students in the first year of college.

We wish to expand these investigations to include the naturalistic observation of group formation and group function on operation of students, as a longitudinal study. Our immediate need is for the consultant services of a cultural anthropologist.

Frank Noble
Lawrence Wrightman
Geo. Peabody College
for Teachers

Our concern is with the relationship between one's view of others (philosophy of human nature) and counseling effectiveness. Wrightman has developed a scale to measure an individual's philosophy of human nature (e.g., his view of people in general as simple or complex, similar or different, trustworthy or untrustworthy, altruistic or selfish, independent or conforming to group pressures, and rational or irrational). The scale has adequate reliability and validity. It will be administered to counselor trainees in the counseling practicum and the Summer NDEA Institute. It will be related to counseling effectiveness through the use of several diverse criteria: supervisor's ratings, peer nomination, and academic success in previous counseling and guidance courses.

It is hypothesized that the counselor trainees judged as least effective will possess unfavorable and overly simplified views of human nature, as contrasted with counselors judged as more effective. Similar validating procedures will be carried out with a group of experienced school counselors. If the instrument is demonstrated to be valid in this research it may prove helpful in the future in the selection of candidates for counselor education programs.

Herman Peters
Ross Mooney
Ohio State University

Proposition: there are multiple roles for functioning with allied activities for school counselors.

Questions:

- 1) Are our present school counselor education preparation programs too one-role centered?
- 2) Should we as counselor educators engage in the various aspects (phases, etc.) of preparation for the training of school counselors in different roles?
- 3) Is there a foundation or cluster of basic learning experiences for counselors -- regardless of role function?
- 4) What is the role of behavioral scientists in school preparation of the counselors?

These are questions which we intend to explore further.

Fred C. Proff
David Tanenbaum
University of Illinois

In view of what appears to represent one of the broad concerns of this group of conferees, i.e., a need to provide educational experiences that reflect the appropriate literatures of several disciplines, we plan to do the following:

- 1) Test the attitudinal climate of the departments to be involved in a joint venture of training.
- 2) Request consultant services from NIMH to draw upon the professional and technical resources

of that agency in developing the problem.

- 3) Draft tentative programs of training and establish the content and format of experiences.
- 4) Submit a proposal to the appropriate funding agency to conduct a demonstration program.

Milton Schwebel

H.H. Giles

New York University

It would seem of potential value to offer guidance students training in Conflict Episode Analysis, which deals with the diagnosis and treatment of social conflict.

In the realm of the integration, interpretation and use on the job of social science findings there have been extensive tests of values and approaches which might be reviewed.

Also in this realm, there seems to be a need for review of relevant interdisciplinary research.

Buford Stefflre
Wilbur Brookover
Michigan State
University

Research Possibility: Study the process by which the school counselor identifies with the counseling occupation.

Research Questions: What is his idealized model? Who are his professional heroes? Does this change during the preparation program? What is the model career pattern? Can motivational forces be identified which act on the counselor to move him toward starting training? During training? On the job?

Is there concurrent alienation from teachers? How is the counselor perceived by other relevant groups -- teachers, pupils, parents, psychologists, etc.? Are there discrepancies among these views and between the counselors' self-image and that of others?

Methods: Reference group orientation. Interview technique. Observation.

Sample: Students in training. Counselors on the job. Ex-counselors. Teachers planning to be counselors. Undergraduates planning to be counselors.

Lawrence Stewart
Robert Moulton
University of
California

We shall continue with our interest in the following general problems:

- 1) Correlates of achievement striving.
- 2) Antecedents of achievement motivation.

3) Variables which facilitate the expression of achievement motivation through overt achievement.

Harold McCully
United States
Office of Education

It is recognized that perception of self and perception of one's world are inextricably related. Generally, in education we concern ourselves primarily, and sometimes exclusively, with perception of world. The following hypothesis, which could be tested, suggests a sharply contrasting view to the conventional one:

Perception of one's world is a function of perception of self.

Also in this realm, there seems to be a need for review of relevant psychological research.

Research Possibilities: Study the process by which the school counselor identifies with the counseling occupation.

Research Questions: What is his idealized model? Who are his professional heroes? Does this change during the preparation program? What is the model career pattern? Can motivational forces be identified which act on the counselor to move him toward starting training? During training? On the job?

Is there concurrent alienation from teachers? How is the counselor perceived by other relevant groups -- teachers, pupils, parents, psychologists, etc.? Are there discrepancies among these views and between the counselor's self-image and that of others?

Method: Reference group orientation. Interview. Observation. Questionnaire.

Subjects: Students in training. Counselors on the job. Ex-counselors. Teachers planning to be counselors. Undergraduates planning to be counselors.

We shall continue with our interest in the following general problems:

- 1) Correlates of achievement striving.
- 2) Antecedents of achievement motivation.

Barford Stullis
Wilbur Bruchover
Michigan State
University

Lawrence Stawert
Robert Hunter
University of
California

IDEAS OR PLANS FOR RESEARCH OR PROGRAM INNOVATIONS REPORTED FOLLOWING THE CONFERENCE

Harold Bernard In consultation with Solon Kimball, have developed a plan for a research proposal to be submitted to the Oregon State System National Institute of Mental Health. This plan will examine the student system of a high school as it affects the mental health of students. Among variables to be considered are the extent of individual participation in student activities and in the student system of friendship groups.

George Hill An idea for research reported in a letter of January 22:
David Russell
Ohio University A research project on the part played by models in occupational planning and career decision: David Russell is interested in this with younger children and I am particularly interested in it with respect to the decision on the part of older persons to become school counselors. We discussed this with Dr. Kagan and have hopes that as we develop this project we can bring him to our campus for consultation. I am particularly interested in the aspect of it that has to do with what might be called the motivational forces which move people into professional work in the field of guidance. We have so very little research on this and it is a key factor in the whole business that we term "selection."

John D. Krumboltz On March 15 John Krumboltz sent the conference coordinator, Esther Lloyd-Jones, a copy of a research proposal to the National Institute of Mental Health, entitled "Experimental Guidance Techniques for Behavior Change," which he states in a covering letter was generated "partially as a result of your stimulating conference."

This proposal is for a series of studies designed to provide answers to questions such as the following:

- 1) To what extent will systematic reinforcement of socially desirable response categories produce increased frequencies of the relevant socially desired behavior?
- a. What is the relative reinforcing effect of different types of counselor verbal responses: evaluative (e.g., "good"), accepting (e.g., "I understand"), judgmental (e.g., "correct"), and informative.
- b. To what extent do certain non-verbal cues (e.g., nodding, smiling) add to the reinforcing value of verbal cues?

- c. What effect do certain counselor characteristics (e.g., sex, manner of dress, degree of "expertness") have on the reinforcing value of his responses?
 - d. How do subjects' preferences, characteristics and prior histories of reinforcement interact with the different counselor reinforcement techniques and counselor characteristics in affecting the desired behavioral outcomes?
2. To what extent will the acquisition of socially desirable responses be facilitated by the provision of social models to demonstrate the desired behavior?
- a. What characteristics of the models (e.g., position in community, age, grade point average, athletic ability) affect the extent to which each model will be imitated?
 - b. What is the relative effect on imitative behavior of having the model deliberately demonstrate the desired behavior as opposed to having him incidentally demonstrate the desired behavior while presumably engaged in some other activity?
 - c. In what ways should there be congruences and differences between characteristics of the model and the subject (e.g., relative age, type of problem, home background, financial resources, sex) if imitative behavior is to be maximized?
3. To what extent will socially maladaptive behavior be extinguished by reducing the reinforcement contingent on that behavior and by reinforcing other behaviors which are incompatible with the maladaptive behavior?

Of the series of studies proposed, some will involve extended treatments and follow-up assessments over a three year period of time. Others will be of relatively short duration. Each study would compare the effects of several relevant techniques upon a defined behavioral objective. Each such study will be under the direction of the principal investigator with the assistance of the research coordinator.

In his discussion of the significance of this research, the author states:

"Progress in the field of guidance cannot be made until the objectives of guidance are operationally defined and knowledge is available on the relative effectiveness of alternate procedures for obtaining each objective. This basic realization was strengthened at the "Research Development Conference to Strengthen the Bridge between Scientific Knowledge and its Applications in Guidance," January 6 through 10, 1963, supported by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health, the Cooperative Research Division of the U.S. Office of Education, and the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation. Discussions with behavioral scientists and with other

leaders in the field of guidance clearly pointed to the necessity for developing theoretically based guidance techniques which have known probabilities of achieving specified aims."

This research proposal represents a systematic experimental attempt to apply a behavioral approach to guidance; so far as the author knows it is the first such attempt.

Paul F. Munger
University of
North Dakota

Draft of a research project. Dr. Munger is consulting with Dr. Burchard, sociologist, Dr. Howard, ethnologist, Dr. Koenker, economist, Dr. Robinson, historian, and Dr. Tomasek, political scientist. Sent to conference staff March 27:

The major question to be answered in this study is: What effect does an organized guidance program have on the students, schools and communities? More specifically, an attempt will be made to answer the following questions:

- 1) Do students in guidance schools make more appropriate educational, vocational and personal choices, plans and adjustments than students in schools that do not have guidance programs?
- 2) Do schools which have guidance programs exhibit characteristics different from schools which do not have guidance programs?
- 3) Do personnel within schools which have guidance programs manifest characteristics different from personnel within schools which do not have guidance programs?
- 4) Do Parents whose children are in schools which have guidance programs manifest characteristics different from parents whose children are in schools which do not have guidance programs?
- 5) Do communities whose schools have guidance programs exhibit characteristics different from communities whose schools do not have guidance programs?

The study will take five years. It will be based on a random sample of thirty-five schools of predetermined size, each assigned to one of three conditions: 1) an experimental condition for five schools in which a comprehensive guidance program will be established for the school, 2) a Hawthorne effect condition, in which the pupils in five schools will be informed that they are participating in an experiment, 3) the control condition -- the twenty-five schools in this condition will be divided into control groups of five schools each. Measures of student behavior and changes in the school will be obtained by available instruments, techniques, and methods and by instruments to be developed and tested before the beginning of the study. A number of hypotheses concerning changes in students, changes in

teachers, changes in schools, changes in communities, changes in parents, changes in life patterns over a long period of students graduated from school, and changes in students who attend college after graduation from schools, resulting from a guidance program have been developed and will be tested.

George A. Pierson
Queens College of the
University of the
City of New York

Dr. Pierson wrote, on May 9, that the Arden House Conference, particularly the discussion of freedom and responsibility there, had much to do with his decision to prepare the research proposal which is summarized here.

The research proposal is addressed to the following questions:

- 1) As seen by the American college or university student, what is the academic community?
- 2) Where does the student obtain his prevailing view of the academic community?
- 3) Does his view of the academic community include an appreciation of the historical significance of the academy?
- 4) How does the student view his role in the academic community?
- 5) Has the student's view of his role and his relationship changed during the past 15 years?

The author hypothesizes that 1) the American college or university student's view of his role in the academic community has changed significantly since the end of World War II; and 2) he has little appreciation of the historical significance of the nature of the academy as a social institution.

The investigator proposes to study the role of the undergraduate student in the academic community by interviewing informed persons and by examining relevant material. Particular attention will be paid to the writings of students during the years 1946-1963.

Changes in NDEA
Counseling and
Guidance Institute
Programs following
the Arden House
Conference

Dr. C. Harold McCully, Chief, Contract Operations Unit, Counseling and Guidance Institutes Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, reported on February 4 in a letter to Lester Nelson, Assistant Vice President, Fund for the Advancement of Education, the following: Since the Conference a number of pioneering ideas emanating from it have already been incorporated into Institutes to be conducted during the academic year 1963-64.

The original plan of the conference called for two evaluations of it by the participants; one at its conclusion and another about three months later. Unfortunately, a bus strike necessitated closing the conference three hours earlier than had been planned, in order that all participants could make airplane connections.

IV

Therefore, there was no formal evaluation of the conference immediately following its deliberations. A number of participants, however, responded to the request of the conference staff for letters expressing their reactions. These are summarized in the first part of this section.

The recorders met ten days after the conference for a post-conference evaluation session; a summary of this session is presented in the second part of this section.

Early in April evaluation forms were mailed to all participants and a summary of the responses to these constituted the third part of this section. Of 22 participants asked to respond to the evaluation, 10 or almost 45% did so. Eighteen, or over 80% of the conference educationists, did so, and 12, or over 75% of the research participants, did so. Since the recorders had already participated in a post-conference evaluation only 3 of them responded to the evaluative questionnaire. Only 3 of the consultant scholars and observers returned the questionnaire. In other words, the responses to the evaluation forms for the most part represent the reactions of those participants to whom the conference was directed -- the counselor educators and their research partners.

The implications of the evaluations are discussed in the final section of this report. Two generalizations may be mentioned here: (1) The immediate post-conference evaluations tend to be somewhat (but not a great deal more) positive than the later evaluations, but the difference was not as great as might reasonably have been anticipated. (2) Most evaluators recognized the primary function of the conference as a stimulus to interaction, saw this as necessary, and looked forward to cooperative as well as individual steps toward more specific developments in the future.

The original plan of the conference called for two evaluations of it by the participants; one at its conclusion and another about three months later. Unfortunately, a bus strike necessitated closing the conference three hours earlier than had been planned, in order that all participants could make airline connections.

IV

Therefore, there was no formal evaluation of the conference immediately following its deliberations. A number of participants, however, responded to the request of the conference staff for letters expressing their reactions. These are summarized in the first part of this section.

The recorders met ten days after the conference for a post-conference evaluation session; a summary of this session is presented in the second part of this section.

Early in April evaluation forms* were mailed to all participants and a summary of the response to these constitutes the third part of this section. Of 59 participants asked to respond to the evaluation, 40 or almost 68%, did so. Eighteen, or over 90% of the counselor educators who participated and 15, or over 71%, of the research partners responded. Since the recorders had already participated in a post-conference evaluation only 3 of them responded to the evaluative questionnaire. Only 3 of the consultant scholars and observers returned the questionnaire. In other words, the response to the evaluation forms for the most part represents the reactions of those participants to whom the conference was directed -- the counselor educators and their research partners.

The implications of the evaluations are discussed in the final section of this report. Two generalizations may be mentioned here: (1) The immediate post-conference evaluations tend to be somewhat (but not a great deal more) positive than the later evaluations but the difference was not as great as might reasonably have been anticipated. (2) Most evaluators recognized the primary function of the conference as a stimulus to interaction, saw this as necessary, and looked forward to cooperative as well as individual steps toward more specific developments in the future.

* See appendix for sample copy of this form.

Summary of Evaluative Comments Received Immediately Following Conference

(From 22 letters, 12 from counselor educators, 10 from research partners)

The Conference as a Whole

The general tenor of the comments was strongly positive. Reasons given for this positive evaluation included:

1. Helped crystallize perceptions of needed directions in developing theory and research in guidance and counseling.
2. Developed new questions through interaction of participants.
3. Papers were stimulating and topics covered a broad range.
4. Introduced social scientists to field of guidance.
5. Improved the acquaintance and possibilities for cooperation between counselor educators and research partners.
6. Served as a stimulus to current research activities.

Specific Weaknesses of the Conference

Comments and suggestions on ways in which the conference might have been improved reflected points of view that were sometimes contradictory. They included:

1. Keynote paper should not have been given by a clinician.
2. Clinical problems, because they are immediate, should have been dealt with concurrently with basic scientific issues.
3. Existential psychology is not an area in which bridges can be built between knowledge and practice and therefore should not have been the subject of one of the four papers.
4. The role of the guidance counselor should have been clarified for the research partners and other behavioral scientists before the conference.
5. The place of work in our society was given too little consideration.
6. The behavioral scientists seemed at times to be too concerned with minor points and overly-critical. Opening discussions with an existentialist paper may have contributed to this.
7. There should have been a synthesis of conference findings and firm recommendations for future action.

Effect of Conference on Future Plans and Activities of Participants

1. Plans being developed for work with research partner. (See Section V for detailed reports of these.)
2. Will work more closely with social scientists on faculty in developing future programs of counselor education.
3. Desire services of one of Project Scholars as consultant. (in only 3 cases)
4. Will work toward local or regional conferences on plan of Arden House Conference.

Summary of Informative Comments Received Immediately Following Conference
(From 32 letters, 13 from counselor educators, 19 from research partners)

Summary of Recorders' Post-Conference Evaluation Session

January 22, 1963

The general tenor of the comments was strongly positive. Reasons given for this positive evaluation included:

1. Helped crystallize perceptions of needed directions in developing theory and research in guidance and counseling.
2. Developed new questions through interaction of participants.
3. Papers were stimulating and topics covered a broad range.
4. Introduced social scientists to field of guidance.
5. Improved the acquaintance and possibilities for cooperation between counselor educators and research partners.

The consensus was that the conference, in terms of its dynamics and of the level of participation, was highly successful.

The recorders felt, however, that if the conference was also to be successful in terms of its long-range goals, the behavioral scientists needed further clarification regarding the role and function of guidance, and that all participants needed continuing stimulation and encouragement, especially in developing research plans and submitting them to fund-granting agencies.

They suggested that the conference staff undertake, as part of the conference follow-up, to partially meet these needs. The steps taken toward this end are described in Section VII.

1. Behavioral psychology is not an area in which bridges can be built between knowledge and practice and therefore should not have been the subject of one of the four papers.
2. The role of the guidance counselor should have been clarified for the research partners and other behavioral scientists before the conference.
3. The place of work in our society was given too little consideration.
4. The behavioral scientists seemed at times to be too concerned with minor points and overly-critical. Opening discussions with an experimental paper may have contributed to this.
5. There should have been a synthesis of conference findings and five recommendations for future action.

Effect of Conference on Future Plans and Activities of Participants

1. Plans being developed for work with research partner. (See Section V for detailed reports of these.)
2. Will work more closely with social scientists on faculty in developing future programs of counselor education.
3. Devote services of one of Project Scholars as consultant. (In only 3 cases.)
4. Will work toward local or regional conferences on plan of Arden House Conference.

Summary of Responses to Post-Conference Evaluation Questionnaire

Forty responses were received of 59 questionnaires mailed — a 68% return. Signatures were not required, therefore an analysis of the returns by source of response may not be entirely accurate. Identification of questionnaires by post-mark and content, in the case of those returned unsigned, suggests that:

1. 90%, or 19, of the counselor educators responded. 71%, or 15 of the research partners responded. In addition, 3 recorders and 3 consultant scholars or observers responded.
2. In each case in which a research partner responded, the counselor educator with whom he attended the conference also responded. As the above figures indicate, in only four cases did a research partner not respond when a counselor educator did.
3. There was no pattern of agreement between the counselor educators and their research partners in their evaluation of the conference and perceptions of the conference experience. Differences ranged from one sharp contrast between a negative and a strongly positive reaction to both being strongly positive, to slight differences in identifying specific aspects of the conference that were good and not good.
 - a. There was no apparent tendency for counselor educators to be more positive in their evaluations of the conference than the research partners, nor any other clear pattern of differences in perception between the two groups.
4. Responses to the questions on conference outcomes were similar in all 15 cases. That is, counselor educators reported a general interest in or specific new or continuing plans (14 of the total 19 responses reported specific plans) for enlisting the help of their research partners or other social science faculty members in program or research, while research partners reported new perceptions of or definite plans for future involvement in program or research in counseling and guidance.
 - a. It should be noted, however, that in a number of instances, representing probably about half of the 21 pairs of counselor educators and research partners at the conference, there was already a close working relationship between the educator and his partner or the potential for such because of the position held by the partner (e.g., Director of Bureau of Educational Research, Professor of Educational Psychology, etc.).
 - b. Also, 11 of the research partners were from the field of psychology.
5. Responses to questions regarding future directions also reflected a consensus among counselor educators and research partners of the need for further steps to strengthen the cooperation between counselor educators and behavioral scientists, including future conferences, for which a number of designs were suggested, and some means (not clearly specified) for continuing exchange of information. However, the specific recommendations of counselor educators and those of their research partners did not tend to parallel each other, suggesting that sufficient interest was stimulated in both groups to evoke independent consideration of future needs.

6. The differences in perceptions of the conference experience reflected by the responses to the questionnaires are striking, as indicated by the following summary, but, as noted, reflect no clear pattern of difference in perception between counselor educators and social scientists.

Summary of Responses to Questionnaire

The Conference

1. Was the Arden House Conference, generally speaking, an effective way, in your opinion of trying to stimulate the upgrading of guidance and counselor education?
 - 1) Yes (28)
 - 2) A good idea and probably effective -- could have been more so -- all participants may not have been stimulated; effectiveness cannot be appraised; one conference cannot produce long range results; problem needed clearer definition (9)
 - 3) No -- idea did not work; no specific direction and no conclusion. (3)
2. What, specifically were some effective aspects of the conference?
 - 1) Opportunities for informal interaction and exchange of ideas. (14)
 - 2) Interdisciplinary approach and clarification of various fields. (13)
 - 3) Conference planning -- directed but flexible. (8)
 - 4) Stimulating speakers. (6)
 - 5) The setting. (6)
 - 6) Opportunity for interaction in small or large groups and with speakers. (4)
 - 7) Receipt of papers in advance. (3)
 - 8) Selection of research partners from same institution. (3)
 - 9) Exchange of ideas between counselor educators and behavioral scientists, with each gaining new information. (2)
 - 10) Use of specific questions as focal points for conference. (2)
 - 11) Use of recorders. (1)
 - 12) Open-ended conclusion. (1)
3. What were some aspects that were not so good?
 - 1) Lack of time (2)
 - a. Lack of time for small group discussion (5)
 - b. Lack of time for guidance people to obtain pertinent information (2)
 - c. Lack of time for partners to discuss collaboration (1)
 - d. Lack of time for full discussion of all material (2)
 - 2) Project Scholars did not appear sufficiently briefed in guidance to serve adequately as consultants. (5)
 - a. Scholars' papers did not appear sufficiently relevant to guidance. (2)
 - 3) Some of the substantive material, especially the May paper, was on a theoretical level too general to generate research in guidance. (5)
 - 4) Small group discussions not always fruitful because:
 - a. Task of developing questions for speakers too restrictive (1)
 - b. Lacked focus on worthwhile problem (1)
 - c. Leadership not constant (1)
 - d. Lack of time (See above)

- e. Experts tended to dominate discussions (1)
- 5) Discussion periods often irrelevant and non-productive and lacking in closure. (4)
- 6) Some participants too assertive; tended to dominate discussions (3)
 - a. Failure of some participants to read papers before coming to conference. (1)
- 7) The speakers read papers which the participants had read prior to conference (3)
 - (Note: This was not so, each Project Scholar presented a new paper at the conference which developed and expanded the ideas in his paper distributed to participants before the conference.)
- 8) Research partners were not sufficiently briefed prior to conference. (3)
- 9) There was lack of closure and development of firm plans for use of consultants and collaboration of counselor educators and research partners. (2)
- 10) Some participants could not accept new ideas (2)
- 11) There were no aspects that were not so good (2)
- 12) Too much food (1)

4. What, in your opinion, were some pretty serious weaknesses?

- 1) There were no serious weaknesses (9)
- 2) Behavioral scientists and counselors educators do not yet know each other well enough to discuss questions to which conference addressed. (3)
 - a. Inclusion of people not geared to scientific approach (1)
 - b. "Experts" overwhelmed less sophisticated participants. (1)
 - c. Needed resource people to consult with participants on writing research proposals (1)
 - d. Discussions could not lead to testable hypotheses in guidance. (2)
- 3) Counseling and guidance were not sufficiently defined. (5)
- 4) Lack of clear goals and closure in discussion (including testable hypotheses) and in conference as a whole. (5)
- 5) Speakers lacked adequate knowledge in counseling and guidance (4)
- 6) Conference was over-organized, preventing freedom to express wild ideas. (2)
- 7) Too much emphasis on psychotherapy (2)
 - a. Poor use of evening hours (1)
- 8) Lack of time for interaction in small groups (2)
- 9) Lack of time in large groups (1)
- 10) Lack of time for interaction with research partner (1)
- 11) Selection of participants (1)
 - a. Should have included elementary and secondary counselors (1)
- 12) Counselors too concerned with own status (1)
- 13) ABC's of conference technique were ignored (1)
- 14) Conference too long unless were more papers (1)
- 15) No comment (1)

5. By what means, specifically, could the conference have been made more effective as an instrument for upgrading guidance and counselor education?

- 1) Opening lecture on counseling and guidance, and/or other means of orienting all participants to field (preliminary papers, pre-conference discussions between counselor educators and research partners, role playing, etc.) should have been provided (10)
- 2) Conference should have been organized around specific assumptions concerning the role and functions of the guidance worker and the philosophical foundations of guidance (10)

- 3) Conference should have had more definite scientific focus (e.g., a single research problem, one behavioral science), and built-in action plans (e.g., to test ideas of hypotheses presented, etc.) (8)
- a. "Up-grading" is a negative term; should be replaced (1)
- 4) Lectures should have been specifically directed to relationship with counseling and guidance (4)
- 5) Small groups should have been given better leadership, more time, and specific tasks (e.g., work with expert leaders to develop research proposals and curricular proposals to present to full group) (4)
- 6) Formal statements outlining research findings in given areas should have been presented (2)
- 7) Definite plans for a follow-up conference should have been made (2)
- 8) Conference should have focused only on upgrading guidance and counselor education and not attempted to pursue research per se (1)
- 9) Should have discussed theories of vocational guidance (1)
- 10) Top school counselors and directors of guidance should have been included in conference (1)
- 11) The conference should have concluded with a synthesis of its deliberations (1)
- 12) There should have been less free time (1)
- 13) Project Scholars should have been selected by committee, as representatives of given disciplines as a whole (1)
- 14) Conference accomplished its purpose (1)
- 15) No comment (1)

Conference Outcomes

1. What, if anything, has happened in your own private professional world as a result of the conference?

- a. in terms of your objectives or concepts?

- 1) Clearer perceptions of relationship between behavioral sciences and counseling and guidance (11)
- 2) Stimulated to rethinking of objectives and concepts (7)
- 3) No comment (7)
- 4) Little effect (6)
- 5) Strengthened present objectives and concepts (5)
- 6) Broadened definitions of counselor's role (2)

- b. in terms of program developments or changes?

- 1) Developing and implementing plans for expanding use of behavioral scientists in counselor education programs (17)
(Since it was not always possible to ascertain from the responses whether plans were now being developed or were in process of being implemented, the two stages are reported together here)
- 2) No report (14)
- 3) No change (5)
- 4) Little change in program because already using interdisciplinary foundations (3)
- 5) Now seeking money for program along these lines, that have been developing (1)

- c. in terms of research planned or undertaken?

- (Note: All specific plans for research were reported in Section V and are not therefore reported here in detail.)
- 1) Research contemplated and being formulated (12)

- 2) Research planned (12)
- 3) Research under way (3)
- 4) Research being continued -- stimulated partly by conference (5)
- 5) Writing planned (1)
- 6) Analysis of training for research in counselor education (1)
- 7) No report (6)

d. in terms of closer cooperation between guidance and counselor educators and research partners and/or other members of the social science faculty?

- 1) Cooperation in developing research conceptualizations (9)
- 2) No report (8)
- 3) Already cooperating (7)
- 4) Possibility for cooperation improved by better acquaintance (7)
- 5) Cooperation in developing instruction (6)
- 6) Cooperation in developing new conceptualizations (4)

e. other

- 1) No report (29)
- 2) Realization of arduous nature of interdisciplinary achievement (1)
- 3) Strengthened conviction that counseling and guidance profession can be strengthened through exchange of ideas with scientists (1)
- 4) Written paper on problem (3)
- 5) Ordered new books (1)
- 6) Departmental staff exploration of all disciplines within university (2)
- 7) Quoted Kagan's paper (1)
- 8) Want to make greater contribution to counselor education (from a research partner) (1)
- 9) Recognized need for more attention to dynamics of new techniques and emerging socio-economic and political patterns (1)

Future Directions

1. What further steps might be taken cooperatively that would be useful in upgrading counselor and guidance education through strengthening the theoretical foundations of guidance?

- 1) Follow-up conference or conferences (11)
- Specific suggestions for conference design or focus:
 - a. Base conference on carefully formulated philosophical assumptions about guidance (1)
 - b. Focus on reactions of social scientists to problems in guidance and reactions of counselor educators to these reactions (1)
 - c. Focus on philosophical foundations (1)
 - d. Utilize small groups to develop paper on application of conference speakers' ideas to guidance (1)
 - e. Separate conferences for different disciplines (2)
 - f. Frequent conferences devoted to professional growth of counselor educators (1)
 - g. Focus on model programs of counselor education (1)
- 2) Use behavioral scientists on staff of counselor education programs (8)
- 3) Increased attention to research by guidance people, including research on structure of guidance, the uses and limitations of tests, anticipatory guidance of high school students for college, junior high school students for high school, etc. (8)

- 4) Further study of philosophical assumptions underlying guidance (2)
- 5) Development of a theory for guidance per se, derived from but not tied to theories in various behavioral sciences, within the framework of a general theory of interpersonal processes and of personality change and development (3)
- 6) Wide distribution of conference findings, including discussion at next two APGA conventions (2)
- 7) Post-doctoral program for counselor educators in behavioral sciences (1)
- 8) Selection of behavioral scientists to learn more about guidance (1)
- 9) Support of cooperative publications (1)
- 10) Raise quality of journals (1)
- 11) No comment (3)

2. Are there further plans, programs, research resources which might be cooperatively developed?

- 1) Employment of behavioral scientists in counselor education (4)
- 2) Inter-institutional collaboration in research and writing (4)
- 3) More study of methodologies of the various disciplines and development of research based thereon (3)
- 4) Develop model programs of counselor education (2)
- 5) More conferences (2)
- 6) Develop a structure for an exchange of ideas (2)
- 7) Study relative effects of counselor "openness" vs. counseling "technique" on counseling process (1)
- 8) Involve one of roject 3scholars in guidance research (1)
- 9) Encourage behavioral scientists to do research in guidance settings (1)
- 10) Ally ourselves with programs to effect full employment, disarmament, integration, etc. (1)
- 11) Possibilities too numerous to report (3)
- 12) No comment (3)

3. Do we need some cooperative provision for continuing exchange of information?

- 1) Yes -- need some kind of publication or clearing house (20)
- 2) Yes -- through exchange teaching and participation in seminars (2)
- 3) Yes -- should have both clearing house and series of meetings (2)
- 4) Should develop bibliographies to distribute (1)
- 5) Maybe -- but is available material too vast to handle comprehensibly (1)
- 6) Maybe -- depends on information to be shared (1)
- 7) Probably not -- but travel funds would be most useful for exchange of ideas (1)
- 8) Don't know (3)
- 9) No -- present journals serve this purpose (3)
- 10) No -- "elite" training institutes should disseminate information (1)
- 11) No comment (5)

4. What plans, if any, should be made for future conferences?

- 1) Should have more conferences (31)
- Specific suggestions:
- a. Focus on examination of guidance progression -- the future
 - b. Focus on guidance role in work with children for whom social changes are essential
 - c. Focus on selected areas of guidance and counseling

- d. Focus on one behavioral science at a time -- as seen by scientists, as seen by guidance person
- e. Include more substantive material
- f. Have longer pre-planning period
- g. Include 4 or 10 papers by counselor educators
- h. Focus on 2 or 3 disciplines, especially anthropology, political science, and economics
- i. Focus on examination of programs of counselor education
- j. Involve other kinds of people.
- k. Give more opportunity for participants to become involved
- l. Concentrate on synthesis of materials from research-oriented discussants
- m. Limit follow-up conference or conferences to those who have done something concrete as a result of this conference.
- n. Focus on examination of uses and limitations of testing
- o. Design conference for effective "group guidance" -- use of small groups, dyads, etc.
- p. Hold regional conferences
- q. Emphasize research methodology
- r. Focus on ways to study children and their behavior
- s. Focus on cultural change and alienation of youth
- t. Focus on science of social change
- u. Focus on philosophical foundations
- 2) No comment (7)
- 3) Don't know (1)

5. Anything else that does not fit into above?

- 1) Contributions of this conference (18 responses)
 - a. Stimulated new ideas and/or compelled re-thinking of passionately held beliefs (11)
 - b. Size of conference was perfect but counselor educators failed to participate as much as they should have (2)
 - c. Should awaken need for clear image of guidance and true scholarship in field (2)
 - d. Project Scholars excellent and/or good (2)
 - e. Points way toward statesmanlike approach to guidance problems (1)
- 2) Should chose future Project Scholars more carefully (2)
- 3) Should form regional councils for study and research (2)
- 4) NIMH and Office of Education should be encouraged to continue support (1)
- 5) Selection of participants should not be tied to NDEA Institutes (1)
- 6) No comment (16)

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

VII

CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

In addition to the post-conference evaluations reported in the preceding section, the conference staff attempted to reinforce the effects of the conference in the following ways.

1. Soon after the conference a personal letter was written to each conference participant acknowledging the nature and quality of his contribution to the conference, reminding him that the consultant services of the Project Scholars were available until June 30th, enclosing a copy of the idea for further work on conference concerns which he and his partner developed at the conference, and urging him to report all progress in this or related plans.
2. Early in April, four rather different papers on guidance as a field -- "The School Counselor in Transition" by Willis E. Dugan, An Address at Minnesota Counselors Association Mid-Winter Conference, February 1, 1963, "The School Counselor: Strategy for Professionalization" by C. Harold McCully, Personnel and Guidance Journal, April, 1962, "Results and Achievements to Date: The Failures and Successes of Current Guidance Practices" by George A. Pierson, Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences, November, 1961, "Guidance: The Science of Purposeful Action Applied Through Education" by David V. Tiedeman and Frank L. Field, Harvard Educational Review, Fall, 1962 -- were mailed to all participants. Also included in this mailing was a paper by Solon Kimball, "Social Science Research and Higher Education", Human Organization, Winter 1962-1963, suggesting uses of the anthropological concept of rites of passage in educational research.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED .

VIII

CONFERENCE FINDINGS

Conference Findings

Behind every theory, every logical argument, every plan of action lie assumptions. When the theory has been tested, the argument debated, the plan put into action these assumptions can sometimes be re-examined. One assumption on which plans for this conference were based was that counselor educators and behavioral scientists could work together to improve programs of counselor education and practice in guidance, and to develop research relevant to guidance concerns.

How gratifying it would be to set down as the first conference finding an unequivocal statement that this assumption was sound. But to do so would be to declare that, in four days on a mountaintop, seventy people were able to demonstrate that the battle to wrest conceptual unity out of the multiplicity of specialized and divided fields of knowledge can be easily won; that those who are concerned that "our wealth of facts is not necessarily a wealth of thoughts"* are tilting at windmills. We did not, needless to say, effect such a demonstration. Rather, the conference provided a clear view of the gulf which separates the practitioner, who must always be concerned with values and therefore with the irrational, and with the individual case and therefore with the inadequacy of generalizations, from the scientist whose work is an affirmation of his commitment to rational solutions and the efficacy of generalizations. And clearly heard was a confusion of tongues -- that unwelcome offspring of the marriage of convenience between specialization and Whitehead's Fallacy of the Perfect Dictionary.

The first conference finding must be, therefore, a highly circumspect statement. The conferees, both the behavioral scientists and the counselor educators, in general affirmed that a closer working relationship, directed toward guidance concerns and allied to the disciplinary background and research interest of the scientists, could be mutually profitable; furthermore, in a number of instances they took concrete initial steps toward such a relationship.

Even this statement must, however, be qualified. It is necessary to note that in a number of cases the research partners already had at least a working acquaintance with the counselor educators; that is, they were members of the faculty of the College of Education, associated with educational research, or even already participating in some way in the program of guidance education. There were, on the other hand, instances in which the research partner had had no previous working association of any kind with the counselor educator, yet in general the level of participation at the conference of these persons was as high or higher than that of others of their group. Also, there was no inherent disadvantage, and very possibly an important advantage, in the selection of research partners who already had a certain amount of sophistication in matters relating to education since, in the length of time available, the counselor educators found themselves unable to clarify for the scientists the role and function of guidance in the educational system.

* Ernst Cassirer, An Essay on Man, Garden City, New York, Doubleday Anchor Book, 1954, p. 40.

We are also aware that affirmation of willingness or even of intent is no guarantee of a fait accompli. On the other hand, without willingness and intent that single step with which even the longest journey begins will never be taken. The participants were unanimous in believing that the goal was worth the attempt to reach it, while being at the same time aware that any clear-cut advance would require continuing cooperation on the national as well as the local level. The fact that some counselor educators and their research partners were working toward conference goals before the conference is strong evidence of readiness for this undertaking.

A second assumption underlying the conference was that there are substantive materials in the behavioral sciences which are not now contributing to training, practice, and research in guidance and which could thus contribute. The confirmation of this assumption constitutes the second conference finding.

This was made clear at the conference in two ways. First, a number of participants, both counselor educators and their research partners, reported perceptions of ways in which they could utilize material in the Project Scholars' papers; for example: how Kagan's research on model choice and model building could be used as a basis for research in selection of counselor trainees and for research to identify "critical periods" in child development during which the impact of guidance would be particularly consequential (e.g., Kagan's material suggests that guidance in the elementary school may be of first importance); how Kimball's anthropological perspective on the educational process could be used as a basis for research to identify those points in the system where planned intervention by guidance workers would most enhance opportunities for individual development and learning; how the ideas of May and van Kaam could be applied to a study of the effects of "openness in counseling" on the counseling process; how a holistic approach to the study of secondary education, or of a single secondary school, could be used to discover what the guidance function in the school structure is, as contrasted with what it purports to be.

Second, the discussion of the material in the conference presentations served as a point of departure, especially in the small group sessions, for suggestions of other potentially relevant theory and research, much of it somewhat different or sharply dissimilar. Thus, the conference not only pointed out certain definite avenues for new exploration, but also served to suggest both the wealth of yet untapped sources and the variety of choices of theoretical frameworks, not only among disciplines but also within them. These discussions, plus reactions to the May paper and the closing panel discussion, on Thursday morning, of the existentialist versus the empirical approach to the study of man and society, also revealed the participants' concern with contrasts in the philosophical assumptions which underlie different schools of theory and research. Also, as the conference proceeded, the participants became increasingly aware of a need for some sophistication in the methods and methodology related to given sets of theory and research findings.

A third assumption underlying the conference was that knowledge from the behavioral sciences can be meaningfully applied to guidance only through the joint efforts of behavioral scientists and guidance people themselves. The demonstration of the validity of this assumption was one of the most salient

conference findings.

The behavioral scientists made it clear that their ability to contribute depended upon help from guidance people. A dominant theme of the conference was the insistence of the behavioral scientists that they could not know what or how to contribute to the guidance field until they understood the role and function of the guidance worker. In fact, should someone unapprized of the conference goals read only the transcripts of the small group discussions he might well conclude that the conference had been convened to discuss this subject. The behavioral scientists did not insist that definitions of the role and function of guidance be delimited by what the guidance worker does now in fact do, even if the entire existing range of guidance activities be taken into account in the formulations. They did contend that concepts of role and function must be formulated on the basis of what the guidance could do, in terms of what society will support, and on the basis of what, as a field, it wants to do, in terms of the needs which, as a profession, it identifies and sees itself as equipped, or able to be equipped, to meet.

The counselor educators acknowledged this argument as sound but tended to dwell on problems of status as this is related to position within the educational hierarchy and to perceptions of guidance role and function by administrators, teachers, and students. That is, they directed considerable attention to the need for structural changes in educational systems to release the full potential of guidance (changes which would require the cooperative efforts of other groups of practitioners in education and of the general public) and seemed, in general, to resist the pressure of the behavioral scientists to define the full potential of their field more clearly. Their resistance did not, however, vitiate their efforts to involve the scientists in cooperative study.

This leads to the fourth and perhaps most critically important conference finding: Guidance people must take the leadership in the effort to obtain from the behavioral sciences, through the cooperation of behavioral scientists, the knowledge necessary to strengthen and broaden the theoretical foundations of guidance practice.

This finding does not, however, imply that leaders in guidance must postpone further explorations of the behavioral sciences until a carefully detailed set of definitions of role and function has been evolved and accepted by the profession as a whole, the educational system, and society. Roles and functions stem from purposes both intrinsic and extrinsic to a given system; the clarification of intrinsic purposes and the comprehension of extrinsic purposes is an incessant process in a human situation that is constantly emergent. *Guidance* role and function cannot be ascertained merely by study of superficially observable possibilities and limits of practice; even more essential is the study of the subtle and mutable human and social factors which determine possibilities and limits; this kind of study falls within the realm of the behavioral sciences. Thus behavioral sciences have a contribution to make not only to the improvement of practice but to its definition.

Nevertheless, the questions to be asked of behavioral scientists must be formulated first by people in guidance. One thoughtful suggestion made at the conference was that such questions need not be scientifically sophisticated; rather, they can be developed from a relatively simple set of observations

collected by a practitioner in the field on the basis of a hunch -- the kind of a hunch which is more apt to come to someone with training and experience in a given field of practice than to a highly competent research person far removed from the field. Questions thus developed can generate hypotheses for research by scientists.

That is, the guidance person must do more than ask the behavioral scientist to show his wares, on the chance that he will find something among them that he can use; he must say to the scientist, "I need to know more about this or this or this; what can you tell me? or, how can you help me to discover this knowledge?", or "I have observed this or that; can you help me to better understand what it means?"

Related to this is the fifth conference finding. Science can help the practitioner to better understand the potentialities and limitations of his practice but it cannot tell the practitioner how to practice in any given instance; this can be a barrier to communication between scientists and practitioners.

Substantive knowledge, no matter how broad in scope, is only a part of the practitioner's equipment. The practitioner also needs the capacity to perceive and respond to the infinite variations in human personality, nuances in communication, subtle and shifting relationships among environmental determinants and their kaleidoscopic interactions with individual growth processes. This capacity can be developed only through emulation of able practitioners and supervised experience in practice.

What the researcher finds to be true of 59% of a given group of subjects will not help the practitioner to deal with the other 41%. Thus the practitioner operates in the No Man's Land which lies between the valid generalization and the uniqueness and unpredictability of a given individual.

Naturally, the wider his grasp of the variety of generalizations which may be relevant to a particular individual in a particular situation, the better are his chances of applying them usefully and/or of discovering the extent to which some are not applicable. He can never forget, however, that every generalization is merely a statement of probability, and, furthermore, that different generalizations represent widely differing levels of probability.

Out of these circumstances of practice stem some of the semantic barriers to communication between scientists and practitioners. The ability to classify is an elementary necessity of scientific research; classification requires labels. The sensitive practitioner, on the other hand, is constantly confronted with the realization that labels rarely describe accurately any individual case, no matter how numerous the labels with which it may be tagged. He may tend, therefore, to resist the use of labels and to attempt to confine himself to the use of descriptive terms that are, from the scientist's point of view, more general than specific. This kind of semantic difficulty was apparent at Arden House, especially in the small group discussions. The equally common obstruction to communication caused by the assignment of different specialized meanings to identical terms was also, of course apparent.

The sixth conference finding is even more central to an understanding of the process of interaction between scientists and practitioners than is the fifth. Practice, because it is founded on values, has roots in the irrational as well as the rational; most scientists and practitioners are aware of this but both tend to evade the issue it raises.

By design, the Conference opened with a paper which considered the place of individual values in counseling, human development, and social change, and discussed the forces in human existence which have so far eluded neat and exhaustive identification, classification, and explication by present scientific means. The two papers which followed discussed empirical approaches to the study of man and society; the final paper discussed the development of a logical framework for research.

The conferees were thus presented with the contrast between an approach which many of them termed "unscientific", "mystical", or "irrational" and approaches easily recognized as scientifically valid, or "rational". But, despite the overt rejection of the first paper by many participants, both counselor educators and research partners, it raised questions about the more "rational" approaches which ran like ^{the} warp on a loom through the conference discussion.

Therefore, not because of previous planning but because of the conferees' persistent concern with the issues involved in the contrast between the so-called existentialist approach and the positivist-empirical approach to the study of man and society, the Conference closed with a panel discussion on this subject. It seems needless to add that no consensus regarding the utility of one approach as compared with the other was achieved in the group discussion following the panel's presentation; as Nicholas Hobbs said, "the age-old conflict between the existentialist and the determinist position is a problem which must be constantly re-resolved."

The critical point is that for practitioners the re-resolution of this conflict is an inescapable necessity. Just as the practice of medicine is committed to the notion of human life as a value in itself, so the practice of guidance is committed to the notion of the worth of each human being. To assert that these commitments have a "rational" foundation, in the scientific sense of that word, is to be blind to the knowledge that no philosopher of history or any other scholar dedicated to finding "meaning" in human existence has yet adduced any scientifically respectable proof of the value of human life, the worth of human beings, or the meaning of human existence.

An obviously sound rational argument could be made for the immediate abolition of all public health services and the "mercy killing" of all aged and infirm citizens as unquestionably effective solutions to pressing problems of over-population. Equally rational proposals would be the institution of capital punishment for all juvenile offenders, thus achieving in a single measure relief from the expense of special guidance and rehabilitation services and a partial solution to problems of future unemployment and over-population; and a system to place all academically inferior youngsters in civic work groups at age sixteen where, at a great saving to the tax payer, they would perform civic house-keeping tasks (street cleaning, garbage removal, etc.) in return for room, board, and pocket money (for obvious reasons they would be rendered sterile). Why do we not do these things?

It sometimes seems to counselors that this question is outside the province of many behavioral scientists. Dixon refers to the "psychology which rejects the psyche and retains only the 'ology', the science of the self without the self." The guidance counselor facing a student faces a psyche and he longs for an 'ology' which will open its secrets to him. The guidance counselor who tries to modify environmental factors for the sake of his students is frequently pitted against values and value systems which no set of rational arguments will overcome and he also needs an 'ology' which can equip him for this struggle.

One recurrent illustration at the Conference of the rapidity with which discussions of practice move outside the realm of the scientific was the circular discussions of the role, function and status of the guidance counselor. These discussions tended always to come back to the interrelation of these with the individual values of the counselor, and his capacity to define and accept his responsibilities and to perceive the degrees of freedom available to him for discharge of these. Even the most extended discussion of the structural changes that could facilitate the counselor's effective discharge of his responsibilities tended to return to the individual as change agent.

Allied to this were the discussions of the kinds of individuals who should be selected for training in guidance. There was discussion of the use of tests for selection, of self-selection during the undergraduate years, of clarifying and promoting the image of a profession in order to attract able students to it (without "able" ever being too clearly defined), and of the need for a guidance counselor to be a "mensch" -- a real man. The critical importance of individual values was a clear thread running through all these discussions, but, as is not surprising, a categorical listing of the kinds of values necessary was not developed.

Emphasis upon the uniqueness of individuals and the critical role of values raises questions the scientist cannot be expected to answer categorically. He may, and at the Conference he did, respond by saying "The scientist can only give you guidelines; it is up to you, the practitioner to decide for yourself what you want to do and what you can do before we can help you find out how to do it." And, "If you would be a model for students, you must be a man -- stnad up for your values, whatever they are."

In one form or another, as Nicholas Hobbs pointed out, the tension between positivist and existentialist positions in theory and in practice will persist. Conflicts will need to be constantly re-resolved, and to the extent that some of these re-resolutions are the joint efforts of counselor educators and behavioral scientists, the clarification of the philosophical assumptions underlying counseling and guidance, for which many participants asked in their evaluations of the Conference, may proceed that much more repaidly.

Up to this point the conference findings have had to do with some fundamental assumptions underlying the conference and with some rather general observations about the process of interaction between the counselor educators and behavioral scientists. The conference findings which follow have to do with specific outcomes of the Conference, observations about it, and proposed

directions for future developments. All of these findings are based both on the Conference itself and on the conference follow-up, including the evaluations.

The seventh conference finding is that: Through the joint efforts of counselor educators and behavioral scientists program changes in counselor education can be initiated in a variety of patterns and, in some instances, within a relatively short time.

Following the Conference Dr. C. Harold McCully, Chief, Contract Operations Unit, Counseling and Guidance Institutes Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, reported that: "since the Conference a number of pioneering ideas emanating from it have already ^{been} incorporated into Institutes to be conducted during the academic year 1963-64."

Of the proposals for further work on conference concerns developed at the Conference itself, ten were concerned with plans for program change. The patterns of suggested change varied. In some instances the plan was to give doctoral students wider leeway in selection of courses from the behavioral sciences and opportunity for more specialization in one discipline; in others, to develop interdepartmental cooperation in strengthening the behavioral science content of counselor education programs; in other instances, to organize departmental seminars of staff and graduate students. Cooperation with the social science faculty on a given campus was the foundation of most such plans.

Responses to the evaluation questionnaires indicate that such program changes were being developed or implemented in 10 institutions. In 3 others, an interdisciplinary program had been in effect before the Conference. Responses of research partners to the evaluation questionnaires indicated a firm commitment to continuing cooperation with such programs.

The eighth conference finding is that: Cooperation between counselor educators and behavioral scientists can generate research relevant to guidance concerns.

The proposals for further work on conference concerns developed by the counselor educators and their research partners at the Conference included twelve ideas for research or research development. Reports of activities received following the Conference included reports of five research proposals actually drafted and/or submitted to a fund-granting agency. That is, of the twenty-one pairs of counselor educators and research partners at the Conference five, or over 23%, were actively pursuing a definite research plan. In view of the short length of time which has elapsed since the Conference, this seems to suggest that the conference was effective in this area.

The ninth conference finding is that: The conference participants in general regard this Conference as the first step in a continuing broad cooperative effort to stimulate and assist counselor educators and behavioral scientists to work together to improve guidance practice through strengthening and expanding

the theoretical foundations of counselor education and the development of research relevant to guidance concerns.

Thirty-one, or over 75%, of the 40 responses to the evaluation questionnaire recommended that future conferences be held. In general, the recommendations reflected a desire for conferences more narrowly focused; some suggestions for foci of subsequent conferences were: a single discipline at a time so that both the various schools of thought within the discipline and its methodology could be explored; an exploration of the philosophical foundations of guidance; the role and function of the guidance counselor. (For further details see Section VI, Pages 285ff.)

Twenty-five of the 40 respondents to the evaluation questionnaire, or over 60%, felt that the work envisaged by the Conference would be expedited and encouraged if some central clearing house or other cooperative provision for continuing exchange of information could be established. No clear plan for this was advanced by any of the respondents. Some felt that an agency to collect, clarify, and disseminate relevant interdisciplinary materials, is needed, others that a publication would be useful, others apparently a central office.

Among other future activities suggested by the conference participants in their responses to the evaluation questionnaire were further attention to the development of a theory for guidance, which could serve as a basic framework both for future programs in counselor education and for research; a careful selection of certain behavioral scientists representing various fields to learn more about guidance in order to develop program materials and research; and the development of model programs of counselor education which could then be studied by counselor educators as a whole, in part through a conference on this subject.

A recurrent suggestion in the responses to the evaluation questionnaires was the involvement of practitioners in counseling and guidance (i.e., directors of guidance, guidance counselors in secondary and elementary schools, etc.) in future conferences, and also the encouragement of more and better research by people in the field.

Another suggestion, made by a few participants, was closer inter-institutional cooperation in future work in this area, either through regional councils or on an institution-to-institution basis.

Although specific suggestions for ways of further stimulating and assisting counselor educators and behavioral scientists to work together on the task of improving guidance education, and therefore guidance practice, through program innovation and research development directed toward expanding and clarifying the theoretical foundations of guidance were varied, the almost perfect consensus was that the Conference represented only an initial step in this direction and it must be followed by other formal and extensive efforts in this direction.

finding
The tenth conference, is related to the ninth: Much more intensive exploration of the substantive materials and methodologies available within each of the various behavioral sciences (including, of course, those not

represented at this Conference, such as sociology, economics, *biology*, and political science) should be undertaken as expeditiously as possible, and results widely distributed.

The need for clearer focus on different disciplines, and the varying schools of thought encompassed by each, was stressed in many ways. It was clear to most participants, for example, that a conference planned to focus on one discipline could be only superficially useful unless it was the climax of an exhaustive examination and ordering of the materials to be discussed.

Program changes and research development, to the extent that these must be initiated by counselor educators (which is, as noted above, a *very large* extent), depends upon the counselor educators' knowledge of potentially useful theory, research and methodology.

Most important, this store of background information is the stuff out of which the bridge between scientific knowledge and practice must be built. Means of collecting it, submitting it to qualified critical evaluation, and making it available to counselor educators, cooperating behavioral scientists and guidance trainees need to be developed as promptly as possible.

The eleventh and final conference finding is actually more a comment than a finding. A conference without a "problem" presents difficulties and perplexities to both participants and planners but it can not only identify a series of "problems" for future study which are significantly related but also foster the pursuit of such study.

A conference planned primarily to stimulate interaction between two groups within a relatively broad area of practice and possibly relevant scientific knowledge is, as observed in the introduction, a conference without a "problem", as this is defined in respectable academic circles.

The conferees might have given themselves over to complete preoccupation with the process of interaction, at the expense of any concern with content. This did not happen, although process received much attention, as this report reveals. Some concrete plans for program change and research development did result wholly or partially from the conference. Others seem to be in process of emerging. Many proposals for future joint and separate undertakings were advanced.

But equally worth noting is that the participants were able to use the conference to learn more about avenues to cooperative effort and about obstacles to it which must be overcome. In view of the many obstacles to the kind of cooperative effort envisaged by the conference which cannot be removed -- for example, departmental barriers and rigidities, faculty loads, institutional restrictions on freedom in research development -- this aspect of the conference experience is fundamental to the viability of the plans developed there or later.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

A P P E N D I X

PROGRAM

**A RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE
TO STRENGTHEN THE BRIDGE BETWEEN
SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE AND ITS
APPLICATIONS IN GUIDANCE**

**at
Arden House**

from Sunday, January 6, through Thursday, January 10, 1963

**to consider certain materials from the behavioral sciences
in the light of these questions:**

**What knowledge (both theory and research findings)
is now available from the behavioral sciences that
should be applied in guidance practice?**

**How can the various disciplines of the behavioral
sciences be used in training guidance workers both
for practice and for carrying on research in the
field?**

**What are some ideas for research that might be
undertaken by the guidance educators and their
research partners?**

Supported by grants from:

The National Institute of Mental Health

The Cooperative Research Division of the U.S. Office of Education

The Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation

Sunday, January 6

3:00 p.m.

Registration

8:00 p.m.

General Meeting - Rationale and Goals of the Conference. Questions and discussion.

Monday, January 7

9:00 a.m.

Presentation by Rollo May of "Freedom and Responsibility Reexamined."

10:45 a.m.

Small group discussions - each group to develop questions to submit to Rollo May for further clarification

11:30 a.m.

General Meeting - Discussion of questions from small groups

2:15 p.m.

Presentation by Jerome Kagan of "The Choice of Models."

4:00 p.m.

Small group discussions - each group to develop questions to submit to Jerome Kagan for further clarification

4:45 p.m.

General Meeting - Discussion of questions from small groups

8:30 p.m.

Seminar discussion conducted by Rollo May and Jerome Kagan

Tuesday, January 8

9:00 a.m.

Presentation by Solon Kimball of "An Anthropological View of Social System and Learning."

10:45 a.m.

Small group discussions - each group to develop questions to submit to Solon Kimball for further clarification

11:30 a.m.

General Meeting - Discussion of questions from small groups

2:15 p.m.

Presentation by W. H. Cowley of "A Tentative Holistic Taxonomy Applied to Education."

4:00 p.m.

Small group discussions - each group to develop questions to submit to W. H. Cowley for further clarification

4:45 p.m.

General Meeting - Discussion of questions from small groups

8:30 p.m.

Seminar discussion conducted by Solon Kimball and W. H. Cowley

Wednesday, January 9

9:30 a.m.

Group discussions of conference goals - possible outcomes.

Five groups: each includes counselor educators, research partners, consultant scholars and recorders

11:30 a.m.

Group discussions of conference goals - possible outcomes

Two groups of counselor educators

Two groups of social scientists

1:00 p.m.

Each counselor educator to meet with his research partner to develop plans for future work on conference concerns

3:15 p.m.

Panel discussion - what might or should happen after the conference

Three counselor educators

Three research partners

Thursday, January 10

9:00 a.m.

Summary Panel - Adrian van Kaam, Solon Kimball, Nicholas Hobbs

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTSCounselor Educators

Dugald S. Arbuckle
Professor of Education

Harold W. Bernard
Professor of Education

Paul I. Clifford
Professor of Education

Willis E. Dugan
Chairman; Professor
of Educational
Psychology

Royal B. Embree, Jr.
Professor of Education

Gail F. Farwell
Professor of Education

Robert L. Gibson
Chairman, Department of
Guidance and Counselor
Education

George E. Hill
Director, Guidance
Training Laboratory

Martin Hamburger
Associate Professor of
Education

Lee E. Isaacson
Coordinator of
Graduate Study

John D. Krumboltz
Associate Professor of
Education and Psychology

Ted Landsman
Professor of Education

Institutions

Boston University

Oregon State System
of Higher Education

Atlanta University

University of Minnesota

University of Texas

University of Wisconsin

University of Toledo

Ohio University

New York University

Purdue University

Stanford University

University of Florida

Research Partners

Gene Phillips
Associate Professor of
Educational Philosophy

Earl Zwetschke
Associate Professor of
Psychology

Tilman C. Cothran
Chairman; Ware Professor
of Sociology

Roger Wilk
Associate Professor of
Psychology; Assistant
Director for Research
in Teacher Education

Frederick H. Ginascol
Associate Professor of
Philosophy

Merle Borrowman
Professor of Educational
History

Sidney J. Kaplan
Chairman, Department of
Sociology

David L. Russell
Associate Professor of
Psychology

Walter Scott Neff
Professor of Psychology

R. K. Bain
Assistant Professor of
Sociology

Robert D. Singer
Assistant Professor of
Psychology

Sidney M. Jourard
Associate Professor of
Psychology

Counselor Educators

William P. McDougall
Associate Professor of
Education

Paul F. Munger
Chairman, Department of
Counseling and Guidance

Frank Noble
Associate Professor of
Education

Herman J. Peters
Professor of Education

Fred C. Proff
Professor of Education

Milton Schwebel
Professor of Education

Buford Stefflre
Professor of Education

Lawrence H. Stewart
Associate Professor of
Education

Robert O. Stripling
Professor of Education;
Head, Department of
Personnel Services

Institutions

Washington State
University

University of
North Dakota

George Peabody College
for Teachers

Ohio State University

University of Illinois

New York University

Michigan State
University

University of
California

University of Florida

Research Partners

T. H. Kennedy
Dean, Division of
Social Sciences

W. L. Cash, Jr.
Associate Professor of
Psychology

Lawrence S. Wrightsman, Jr.
Executive Officer
Department of Psychology

Ross L. Mooney
Professor of Psychology

David E. Tanenbaum
Professor, Jane Addams
School of Social Work

H. H. Giles
Professor of Education
Social Science Department

Wilbur B. Brookover
Director, Bureau of
Educational Research

Robert W. Moulton
Assistant Professor of
Psychology

Benjamin Barger
Co-Director, Student
Health Project; Lecturer
in Psychology

Consultant Scholars and Observers

Caroline Chandler, Chief, Demonstration Section
Research Utilization Branch
National Institute of Mental Health

Morton Deutsch, Bell Telephone Laboratories
Murrayhill, New Jersey

Clovis Hirning, Educational Psychiatrist
Faculty of William Alanson White Institute
Consulting Psychiatrist, Guidance Laboratory
Teachers College, Columbia University

William Hollister, Community Services Branch
National Institute of Mental Health

Consultant Scholars and Observers

C. Harold McCully, Chief, Contract Operations Unit
Counseling and Guidance Institutes Branch
Division of College and University Assistance
U.S. Office of Education

Francis H. Palmer, Social Science Research Council
New York, New York

David Tiedeman, Professor of Education
Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

Adrian van Kaam, Editor, Review of Existential
Psychology and Psychiatry, Duquesne University

Recorders

Willard Blaesser
Dean of Students
City College, City University
of New York

Edmund Gordon
Chairman, Department of
Educational Psychology and Guidance
Yeshiva University

Richard Gummere, Jr.
Instructor in Guidance and
Student Personnel Administration
Teachers College, Columbia University

Carolyn S. Hewson
Instructor in Guidance and
Student Personnel Administration
Teachers College, Columbia University

Jean P. Jordaan
Associate Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Gordon J. Klopf
Associate Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Virginia H. Love
Visiting Associate Professor of
Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Raymond A. Patouillet
Associate Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

George Pierson
Dean of Students
Queens College of the City University
of New York

Donald Robinson
Grants Associate
National Institutes of Health
Public Health Service
Bethesda, Maryland

Conference Staff Assistants

Luiz Antonelli
Head, Department of Social Sciences
Voorhees Technical Institute
New York City

Carolyn McCann
Assistant Professor
Department of Student Life
City College, City University of
New York

Robert T. Merritt, Administrative Secretary
N.D.E.A. Counseling and Guidance Training Institute
Teachers College, Columbia University

x

PLEASE return before May 10, 1963 to Esther Lloyd-Jones, Teachers College
Columbia University, New York 27, NY

Research Development Conference
to Strengthen the Bridge
between
Scientific Knowledge
and
its Applications in Guidance

Arden House

January 6-10, 1963

POST CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Please be entirely frank in your responses. Do not hesitate to be brief,
but, if you find there is insufficient space for a response, feel free to
continue on another sheet.

The Conference

1. Was the Arden House Conference, generally speaking, an effective way,
in your opinion, of trying to stimulate the upgrading of guidance and
counselor education?

.....
.....
.....

2. What, specifically, were some effective aspects of the conference?

.....
.....
.....

3. What were some aspects that were not so good?

.....
.....
.....

4. What, in your opinion, were some pretty serious weaknesses?

.....
.....

5. By what means, specifically, could the conference have been made more effective as an instrument for upgrading guidance and counselor education?

.....
.....
.....

Conference Outcomes

1. What, if anything, has happened in your own private professional world as a result of the conference? Please be specific. Attach any useful documents.

- a. in terms of your objectives or concepts?

.....
.....

- b. in terms of program developments or changes?

.....
.....

- c. in terms of research planned or undertaken?

.....
.....

- d. in terms of closer cooperation between guidance and counselor educators and research partners and/or other members of the social science faculty?

.....
.....
.....

- e. other

.....
.....

Future Directions

1. What further steps might be taken cooperatively that would be useful in upgrading counselor and guidance education through strengthening the theoretical foundations of guidance?

.....
.....
.....

2. Are there further plans, programs, research resources which might be cooperatively developed?

.....
.....
.....

3. Do we need some cooperative provision for continuing exchange of information?

.....
.....
.....

4. What plans, if any, should be made for future conferences?

.....
.....
.....

Anything else that does not fit into the above

.....
.....
.....